REPORT RESUMES

ED 020 407 VT 005 173

A RETROSPECTIVE STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF OUT-OF-SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROGRAMS IN FOUR URBAN SITES.

BY- WALTHER, REGIS H. MAGNUSSON, MARGARET L.
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIV., WASHINGTON, D.C.

PUB DATE NOV 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$6.36 157P.

DESCRIPTORS- *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS, FOLLOWUP STUDIES, *ADJUSTMENT (TO ENVIRONMENT), VOCATIONAL ADJUSTMENT, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, CONTROL GROUPS, EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS, URBAN AREAS, RACIAL DIFFERENCES, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, SEX DIFFERENCES, NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS,

THE PRIMARY CRITERIA FOR JUDGING NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS (NYC) PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS IN CINCINNATI, OHIO, DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA, EAST ST. LOUIS, ILLINOIS, AND ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, WERE COMMUNITY AND WORK ADJUSTMENTS. AN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP COMPOSED OF 392 ENROLLEES WHOSE NYC EXPERIENCE WAS A LITTLE MORE THAN A YEAR AND A CONTROL GROUP COMPOSED OF 205 SIMILAR YOUTHS WHO HAD NOT ENROLLED IN NYC WERE INTERVIEWED TO OBTAIN INFORMATION ON NYC RECRUITMENT, WORK ASSIGNMENTS AND THEIR VALUE, LENGTH OF EXPERIENCE, SUPERVISION, FRIENDLINESS OF FELLOW-WORKERS, COUNSELORS, USEFUL AND DISLIKED ASPECTS OF EXPERIENCE, AND JOB PLACEMENT. THE MOST SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS WERE--(1) THE PROGRAM IS REACHING SERIOUSLY DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, (2) ENROLLEES REPORTED A HIGH LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THEIR NYC EXPERIENCE, (3) THE COMMUNITY AND WORK ADJUSTMENT OF ENROLLEES WAS IMPROVED ON SEVERAL MEASURES, AND (4) FEMALE ENROLLEES MADE GREATER GAINS THAN MALES. SOME PROBLEM AREAS CONCERNED THE PROGRAMS' LESSER EFFECTIVENESS WITH MALES AND WHITE FEMALES THAN WITH NEGRO FEMALES AND THE CONTINUING HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT RATE OF EX-ENROLLEES WHICH WAS PROBABLY RELATED TO THE CHARACTER OF NYC WORK ASSIGNMENTS. ISSUES NEEDING FURTHER EXPLORATION INCLUDED JOB DEVELOPMENT, RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER MANPOWER PROGRAMS, REMEDIAL EDUCATION, FOLLOWUP COUNSELING, AND DIFFERENTIAL ENROLLEE NEEDS. THE EXTENSIVE APPENDIXES INCLUDE TECHNICAL INFORMATION, THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE, OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES, AND SPECIFIC INFORMATION FROM THE CINCINNATI AND DURHAM NYC'S. (MM)

ED020407

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A RETROSPECTIVE STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF OUT-OF-SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROGRAMS IN FOUR URBAN SITES

By:
Regis H. Walther
and
Margaret L. Magnusson

November, 1967

Social Research Group
The George Washington University
Regis H. Walther
Principal Investigator

Contract No. 81-09-66-19
Office of Manpower Policy,
Evaluation and Research
U.S. Department of Labor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study represents the joint efforts of a large number of people. First, we want to thank the staff of the Manpower Administration and the Bureau of Work Programs of the Department of Labor for the excellent cooperation and support given to the research. Mr. Joel Barries, the initial contract monitor, was most helpful during the planning and data collection phase of the contract, as was his successor, Mr. Thomas Joyce, during the later phases of the contract. Mr. Richard Fogarty found solutions to numerous fiscal and budget problems and Dr. George Weber and his assistant, Miss Paula Kartolas, provided an efficient link with the NYC headquarter's office. Mr. William Paschell coordinated the entire enterprise with great understanding and patience. To each of these individuals we want to express our appreciation.

The program administrators in each of the research sites gave outstanding support to the research. Although we are grateful to many individuals for their help, we want particularly to express our appreciation to Mr. William Purscell, Mr. Irwin Holmes and Mr. James Wiggins in Durahm; Mr. Harry Martin, Mr. John Gillespie and Mr. Henry Christmon in Cincinnati; Mr. Philip Waring, Mr. Jack White, Mr. Walter Robinson in East St. Louis; and Mr. Commodore Jones in St. Louis.

The field supervisors at each of the sites guided the collection of the data from records and from interviews; the efficiency with which these tasks were completed was essential to the successful completion of the study. Mr. Albert Capehart, Jr. in Durham, Mr. Murray Weisman in Cincinnati, Mr. Stanley Campbell and Mr. Dewitt Weary, Jr. in East St. Louis, and Mr. Robert Miriani and

Mrs. Mary Canada in St. Louis provided indispensable and able assistance.

Dr. Shirley D. McCune helped design the study and coordinated the data collection in St. Louis. Although she left the staff of the Social Research Group prior to the preparation of this report, and, therefore, is not listed as a co-author, she has had a significant influence on the interpretation of the data and the program implications discussed in this report. Mrs. Beverly Goodrich and Miss Maggie Carter with the assistance of part-time employees carried through the difficult task of coding all the information. Mr. David Reimer, Mrs. Emily O'Neill, and Mr. Harry Wilker wrote the necessary computer programs and processed the data. Mrs. Mary Faux and her assistant, Miss Susan Stinson, ably supervised the many administrative details plus the typing of the report.

Finally, we would like to thank the interviewers who located and obtained information from subjects and the subjects who cooperated by answering the questionnaire.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

HIGHLIGHTS i

Chapter

I INTRODUCTION 1

II BACKGROUND OF STUDIES 6
- Research Sites
- The Out-of-School Programs
- The Research Design

III THE STUDY SAMPLES 19

IV THE OUT-OF-SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROGRAMS 27
- How Enrollees First Heard About NYC
- NYC Work Assignments
- Length of NYC Experience
- Enjoyment of NYC Work
- Importance of NYC Work
- Closeness of Supervision
- Helpfulness of Supervisor
- Friendliness of Fellow-Workers
- Usefulness of NYC Work
- Frequency of Counselor Meeting
- Helpfulness of Counselor
- Most Useful Aspects of NYC Experience
- NYC Help in Getting a Job
- Disliked Aspects of NYC
- Summary

V PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS 44
- Current Activity
- Routes to Employment
- Youth Occupations
- Earnings
- Principal Source of Support
- Police Contacts
- Academic and Vocational Preparation
- Attitude Change
- Distinguishing Characteristics of "Successful" Enrollees
- Summary

TABLE OF CONTENTS, cont.

Chapter Page

VI IMPLICATIONS 59

Job Development
Job Corps
MDTA
Remedial Education
Follow-up Counseling
Differential Needs of Enrollees
    a. Low Self-Esteem Group
    b. Rebel Group
    c. Adverse Situation Group
    d. Disadvantaged Graduate Group

APPENDICES

A Technical Appendix 75

B Interview Schedule 103

C Occupational Categories 113

D The Relationship Between Out-of-School NYC; Experience and Enrollees' Police Records--Cincinnati 116

E The Relationship Between Out-of-School NYC Enrollment and Police Contacts--Durham, N.C. . . 130

HIGHLIGHTS

This paper reports the first phase of a research project, supported by the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research, designed to evaluate the effectiveness of selected urban out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps programs through the use of Experimental and Control groups. The primary criteria established for judging NYC program effectiveness were community and work adjustments. Retrospective samples were used in the initial phase of the research to get usable information about program effectiveness during the first year of the study. Prospective and program component studies are also being conducted as part of the overall research design.

For the retrospective study, Experimental and Control samples were constituted in each of four research sites: Cincinnati, Ohio; Durham, North Carolina; East St. Louis, Illinois; and St. Louis, Missouri. The Experimental sample was composed of enrollees whose NYC experience dated from the fall and winter of 1965-1966, or a little more than a year prior to the date of follow-up interviews conducted in the winter and spring of 1967. The Control samples were composed of similar youths who had not enrolled in NYC. Interviews with subjects in these samples supplemented by a review of police and other records produced the data used in the comparative analysis of the Experimental and Control groups.

Interviewers ascertained the current activity of 438 subjects in the retrospective Experimental sample and completed interviews for 392 of these individuals. The comparable figures for the Control group were 238 located and 205 interviewed. Within the Experimental sample, usable information was obtained for 83 percent of the subjects and full interviews were completed for 74 percent.

While the completion rate for the Control sample was substantially lower (66 percent located and 60 percent interviewed), the interviewed subjects in the Experimental and Control samples were found to be closely matched on a number of variables including sex, race, age, highest school grade completed, percentage living in public housing, and percentage receiving welfare. In both samples, the largest percentage of subjects was made up of Negro females (60 percent) and Negro males comprised the next largest percentage (30 percent). About seven percent of the youth studied were white males and about three percent, white females. The average age of the subjects at the time of interview was a little over 20 years and the highest grade completed, about 10th grade.

The data from this study provided substantial evidence that the out-of-school NYC programs at the four research sites were improving the work and community adjustment of disadvantaged youth. The most significant findings were:

The program is reaching seriously disadvantaged youth. Approximately 25 percent of the Experimental subjects were young people whose families were dependent upon welfare assistance; and less than one-third of them had intact two-parent families. The average enrollee had not completed the 10th grade, and had been out of school for over 17 months at the time of registration. Approximately one-third of the female subjects left school because of pregnancy and about 40 percent of the males had police records. In Cincinnati, where school records were studied, the average IQ score was a little over 80 and academic performance was poor.

The interviewed enrollees reported a high level of satisfaction with their NYC experience. Enrollees gave a high rating to the program, to the type of work performed, to the helpfulness of their supervisors and counselors, and to the friendliness of their fellow workers. Females gave the program a significantly higher rating than males. At three sites (Cincinnati, Durham, and St. Louis) five out of six enrollees considered that their NYC experience was or would be of help in getting a job. In East St. Louis, 54 percent of the enrollees did not think NYC would help them get a job. These responses probably reflect the bleak employment prospects in this city.

Community and work adjustment of enrollees was improved on several measures. Compared to young persons in the Control group, youth with NYC experience had more supplemental and remedial education, were more frequently self-supporting, and were less likely to be unemployed. Police contacts following NYC enrollment were significantly reduced at two of the sites. Almost all of the improvements of enrollees in the areas of employment, self-support, and lowered police contact reflected gains made by the female subsample. In the male subsample, the most significant improvement associated with NYC enrollment was greater participation in academic and vocational education since leaving school. Females also attended more educational or vocational classes than their controls. About one out of four of the Experimental subjects were still enrolled in NYC at the time of interview. Comparison with the Control sample suggests that unemployment seems to be the principal alternative to the NYC for females, while military service is a significant alternative for males.

Three of the studied programs have noteworthy success which can have important implications for other programs. Cincinnati with its energetic job development programs has shown what can be done to help enrollees find jobs. Durham with its imaginative approach to remedial education has demonstrated that even male school dropouts, if properly motivated, will make the effort to improve their verbal and computational skills. St. Louis through its hospital work site has shown that direct training on the job in job skills which can be used at the work site facilitates the employment of the enrollees.

In addition to the evidence of accomplishment, problem areas were noted. For example, the studied programs did not appear to be as effective with males or white females as they were with Negro females; and rates of unemployment remained high among ex-enrollees.

There were very few white females in the sample and the possibility should be considered that there may be disadvantaged individuals in this category who could benefit from the NYC program but who are not applying. To a lesser degree, the same questions may be raised with respect to white males.

A factor contributing to the poorer results with males, may be the character of work assignments most frequently reported by male enrollees, maintenance and unskilled labor. Such assignments may offer limited opportunity for on-the-job training. The NYC program might have a more positive effect on males if a greater variety of NYC jobs with more career potential could be developed for them.

Although youth in the Experimental group had relatively less unemployment than those in the Control group, 28 percent of the Experimental subjects were unemployed at the time of their interview. The percentage of unemployment increased to 38 percent when subjects still enrolled in the NYC were excluded. The comparable percentage for the Control group was 42 percent. It must be concluded that the NYC experience was a substantial factor in reducing unemployment, but it also must be recognized that the programs' work adjustment objectives have not yet been fully realized.

Even at this early stage in the research, the results raise policy issues to be considered by program administrators and suggest areas needing further research exploration. Several of the important issues are job development, relationships with other manpower programs such as the Job Corps and MDTA, remedial education, follow-up counseling, and differential needs of enrollees.

In summary, while the results of this study cannot be generalized to all NYC programs since the programs studied were specially selected, the data demonstrate achievements but also highlight problem areas. Since the time reflected in this study, many improvements in the programs have been made in each of the cities serving as research sites, and it is reasonable to assume that better results are now being obtained. The prospective studies currently under way will test this assumption. A second follow-up interview is planned for the first part of 1968, at which time an additional year will have elapsed since the date of application. On the basis of data developed from these interviews, it should be possible to test more adequately the hypothesis that NYC experience is associated with improved work and community adjustment.

I

INTRODUCTION

This report reflects the first phase of a longitudinal research project supported by the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation and Research, designed to evaluate the effectiveness of selected urban out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps programs. The research was designed to permit a comparison of an Experimental sample of youth who had enrolled in the NYC and a Control sample of similar youths who had not enrolled in the NYC. The primary criteria used in judging the effectiveness of the NYC program were community and work adjustments. Parallel studies were conducted in four cities.

Retrospective samples were used in the first phase of the research project to get usable information about program effectiveness during the first year of the study. The Experimental sample was composed of enrollees whose NYC experience dated from the fall and winter of 1965-66, or a little over a year prior to the date of the follow-up interviews conducted in the winter and spring of 1967. Prospective studies are also being conducted at each of the research sites with the collection of information beginning when the subjects enroll in the program. The follow-up interviews for these studies are scheduled for the early part of 1968.

Study sites were selected in consultation with the NYC staff in Washington, D.C., and through field reconnaissance. The following selection criteria were employed:

- -- Programs should be in full operation and appear to be running well;
- -- Programs should provide as much variation as possible with respect to local conditions and program elements;

- --Program administrators should indicate interest in and support for the research project;

- --Program selection should not result in research overload, that is, the site selected should not already be involved in research projects; and

- --Sites should be urban in character and should be limited to four geographical areas

Programs in Cincinnati, Ohio; Durham, North Carolina; East St. Louis, Illinois; and St. Louis, Missouri, satisfied these criteria and were selected as study sites.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps serves young persons from low-income families through three programs: summer, in-school, and out-of-school. This study is concerned with the out-of-school program which is set up for youths 16-21 years of age who are out-of-school and unemployed. The program seeks to help these young persons to become successfully functioning adults by increasing their employability. The principal means of help are useful work experiences -- useful to the youths as remunerated occupational experiences, and useful to their community through the performance of work in the public interest that would not otherwise be done. This major component of work experience is buttressed by other program elements--remedial education, counseling, and job development.

Urban out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps programs operate in the massive problem area of inner-city poverty. The 1967 Manpower Report[1] outlines this area as follows:

---

[1] U.S.Department of Labor, Manpower Report of the President and A Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization, and Training, U.S. Government Printing Office (Washington, D.C.) 1967

> The failures of our economy and society in providing equal employment opportunities, adequate education and training, and a decent standard of living for all Americans converge in city slums. The people entrapped in the slums bear the brunt of these failures, but through them the community and the Nation reap the consequences--in wasted human resources, in the smoldering and sometimes explosive bitterness or despair of many slum residents, and in the problems of dependency, crime, and juvenile delinquency to which these conditions inevitably contribute.[1]
>
> About one out of every ten workers in the slums of 13 major cities was unemployed in November 1966--an unemployment rate three times the national average.[2]
>
> Nonwhite workers represented three out of every four of the 39,000 unemployed workers in the 10 slum districts surveyed in November 1966.[3]
>
> Teenagers (16 to 19 years old) had an average unemployment rate of 28 percent in these slums--four times the rate (6.8 percent) for workers aged 20 and over.[4]
>
> The unemployment rate was 46 percent for nonwhite girls and 31 percent for nonwhite boys aged 14 to 19 in poverty areas of the country's major cities in March 1966.[5]

This report concluded that the failure of young and inexperienced workers to find employment is a persistent and significant national problem that

> ...emphasizes the need for enlarged and effective measures to bridge the gap between school and work--particularly for school

---

[1] Ibid., p.73

[2] Ibid., p. 74

[3] Ibid., p. 77

[4] Ibid., Idem

[5] Ibid., Idem

dropouts and nonwhite youth, the groups with by far the highest unemployment rates.[1]

The goal of the Neighborhood Youth Corps is to bridge the gap between school and work. Ultimately, the NYC will be judged a success as its enrollees become successfully functioning adults. Preparation for employment and the discharge of military obligations, as well as employment are counted as indications of successful adjustment. Indications of maladjustment, on the other hand, are found in unemployment, dependence on welfare assistance, and in police contacts.

This research hypothesizes that the NYC out-of-school programs helped enrollees to successful adjustments to adult society, and tests the hypothesis through the comparison of Experimental and Control data derived from the four research sites. The effect of the NYC experience was gauged by comparing the two study samples on the criterion variables of community and work adjustment. Comparative data uniformly included the results of interviews with, and police records check of, study subjects in each site. In several sites, additional data derived from school and NYC records augmented this uniform data. The research design thus permitted across-site evaluation of the out-of-school programs and between-site delineation of program differences. An additional goal of the research was to explore research methodology.

[1] Ibid., p. 145

The report begins by describing the four research sites, their out-of-school NYC programs, and the specific research methodology employed at each site. The characteristics of the Experimental and Control samples are then presented with evidence of the degree to which the Control sample can be considered an adequate match of the Experimental sample. The NYC program, as experienced by participating youth, is reported in the next section followed by an analysis of community and work adjustment. The final section discusses the program implications of the research findings.

II

BACKGROUND OF STUDIES

The Research Sites

The 1960 census shows the four site cities to be two very large cities of over 500,000 and two middle-sized cities of approximately 80,000 (see Table 1). In the two large cities, Cincinnati and St. Louis, and in one middle-sized city, East St. Louis, total population had declined in the decade 1950-1960. The percentage of nonwhite in the total population in these three cities, however, was increasing. Durham was an exception to the pattern of declining city population and increasing percentages of nonwhites--in Durham the city population increased in the decade preceding the census, and the percentage of nonwhites remained substantially the same. In 1950, Durham and East St. Louis had substantially the same percentages of nonwhites--36.6 and 33.5, respectively. In 1960, the percentage of nonwhites in East St. Louis had increased to 44.6, while in Durham it remained roughly the same, 36.3.

Each of the site cities was reported in 1960 within a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). With the exception of East St. Louis, which was reported in the St. Louis SMSA, each of the cities was the central city of a larger socio-economic area. In each of the SMSA's, population in the 1950-1960 decade increased; and the percentage of nonwhites in the total SMSA population was, in each case, smaller than the percentage of nonwhites in the total central city population. Again Durham was somewhat of an exception in that population characteristics of its SMSA were more similar to

TABLE 1

SELECTED STATISTICS. FOUR RESEARCH SITES

	Cincinnati, Ohio	Durham, N. Carolina	E.St.Louis, Illinois	St.Louis, Missouri
1 U.S. rank	21	183	175	10
2 Total population, 1960	502,550	78,302	81,712	750,026
3 Percent increase or decrease (-), 1950-1960	-0.3	9.8	-0.7	-12.5
4 Percent nonwhite, 1960	21.8	36.3	44.6	28.8
5 Percent nonwhite, 1950	15.6	36.6	33.5	18.0
6 SMSA[a] population, 1960	1,071,624	111,995	b	2,060,103
7 Percent increase, 1950-1960	18.5	10.2	b	19.8
8 Percent nonwhite, 1960	12.1	32.2	b	14.5
9 Median family income, 1959	$5,701	$4,673	$4,842	$5,355
10 Percent under $3,000	19.6	27.9	30.0	21.7
11 Median school years completed	9.7	9.9	8.7	8.8
12 Percent 4th grade or less	8.2	15.1	13.1	9.1
13 Percent in same house, 1955 & 1960	45.2	46.0	51.6	45.0
14 Percent unemployed, 1960	5.9	4.9	10.5	5.4
15 Indexed crimes, number of recorded offenses, 1965	6,076	1,226	2,046	25,750
16 Estimated population, 1965[c]	495,011	82,136	78,331	703,149
17 Indexed crimes per 1,000 estimated population, 1965	12.3	14.9	25.9	36.6

[a] Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area

[b] East St. Louis is included in St. Louis SMSA

[c] 1965 population is crudely estimated by assuming uniform continuation of 1950-1960 changes.

Sources:

City statistics (lines 1-5, 9-14) from Bureau of Census, U.S.Department of Commerce, County and City Data Book, 1962, U.S. Government Printing Office (Washington, D.C.) 1962, Table 6

SMSA statistics (lines 6-8) from Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1960 Census of Population, U.S. Government Printing Office (Washington, D.C.) 1964. Vol 1, Part 1, Table 63

Crime statistics (lines 15-17) from Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice, Uniform Crime Reports, 1965.U.S. Government Printing Office (Washington, D.C.) 1966. Table 51 those of the central city. Even in Durham, however, the SMSA population growth exceeded that of the central city and the percentage of nonwhites of the SMSA population was less than that of the central city.

The two large cities had the highest median family incomes, the lowest percentages of families with incomes of less than $3,000, and the lowest percentages of adults who had completed less than five school grades. Unemployment was lowest in Durham (4.9 percent), slightly higher in St. Louis and Cincinnati (5.4 percent and 5.9 percent, respectively), and markedly higher in East St. Louis (10.5 percent). From 45 percent (in St. Louis) to 51.6 percent (in East St. Louis) of the cities' 1960 residents had lived in the same house five years previously.

Reported indexed crimes[1] in 1965, relative to estimated 1965 population, were less numerous in Cincinnati and most numerous in St. Louis. St. Louis's estimated indexed crime rate was nearly three times that of Cincinnati, and the crime rate in East St. Louis was more than twice that of Cincinnati.

The retrospective studies were conducted well past the midpoint of the intercensal period, and post-1960 statistics are not uniformly available for the four sites. In two of the sites, St. Louis and East St. Louis, local studies detail and up-date the trends apparent in the 1960 census material.

[1] Indexed crimes are: murder and non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny $50 and over, and auto theft.

A study[1] conducted in St. Louis indicated that the population decrease, evident in the 1950-60 decade, was continuing. Using the Bogue and Duncan composite method for estimating postcensal population, this study put the net postcensal decrease by 1965 at 50,500.[2] This decrease was compounded of a decrease of 76,700 in the white population, partially offset by an increase of 26,200 in the Negro population.[3] Most of the city's Negro residents lived in seven census districts in the central city: this area had about 85 percent of the city's 216,000 Negroes in 1960, and about 84 percent of the city's 242,200 Negroes in 1965.[4] Using an index developed by K. E. Taeuber, the report concluded that racial segregation had become intensified in St. Louis between 1960 and 1965.[5]

---

[1] Health and Welfare Council of Metropolitan St. Louis and Metropolitan Youth Commission, Population by Census District in St. Louis City (January, 1967).

[2] Ibid., p 5. This estimate is 3,600 more than the crude estimate reached in Table 1. The Bogue and Duncan estimate results in a crime rate of 36.8 indexed crimes per 1,000 population, as compared with a crime rate of 36.6 with the crude estimate.

[3] Ibid., Idem

[4] Ibid., p 14

[5] Ibid., p 17

Neighborhoods in the central city of St. Louis comprised the target area of the city's Gateways for Youth program. In 1960, 10.5 percent of the men and 12.5 percent of the women in the target area were unemployed; and 60 percent of the employed men held operative jobs while 63 percent of the employed women held semi-or unskilled jobs.[1] The median age of the target area population was 21.5 years, much younger than the median age in the city as a whole, 33.4 years.[2] Available evidence in St. Louis thus describes the typical development of the inner city: the city's growth occurring in outer, suburban areas leaving the city's central area an "enclave of poverty" populated by "economic refugees" driven there by "growing deruralization, by automation, by discrimination, by lack of education and skills.[3]

In East St. Louis an excellent questionnaire study was conducted in the winter and spring of 1963.[4] The percentage of Negroes in the city's

[1] St. Louis Human Development Corporation, Gateways for Youth, January, 1964, p 52a

[2] Ibid., Idem

[3] Ibid.,Idem

[4] Jane Schusky, Employment and Unemployment in East St. Louis, Public Administration and Metropolitan Affairs Program, Southern Illinois University (Edwardsville, Illinois) January 1964

population (54 percent) was almost 10 percent higher than that shown in the 1960 census.[1] The city's population, both white and Negro, was made up of long-time city residents, and the increased percentage of Negroes in the population reflected an exodus of whites to the suburbs.[2] Analysis of the spatial distribution of the city's population by race indicated that East St. Louis was even more segregated than St. Louis.[3]

Differential rates of unemployment between the races were indicated by the survey's findings that 33 percent of the Negroes, as compared with 10 percent of the whites, were unemployed[4]; and that almost one third of the household heads under the age of 30 were unemployed.[5] More than half of the employed Negro household heads, as compared with less than one fourth of the employed white household heads, held jobs as laborers or service workers.[6] About half the labor force had only an eighth grade education or less,[7] and lower educational attainment was more apt to be related to unemployment status for whites than for Negroes.[1] Slightly more than one fourth of the white employed household heads held jobs on the Missouri side of the Mississippi.[2] The occupational categories in East St. Louis with the highest unemployment rates had the lowest percentages of jobs across the river in St. Louis, Missouri.[3]

---

[1] Ibid.,p ix

[2] Ibid.,Idem

[3] Ibid., p 17. The "segregation index" in East St. Louis--the percentage of the population that would have to be redistributed to achieve equal racial proportions by census tracts--was 82. The comparable index in St. Louis was 76 (see fn 5, p.9, supra.).

[4] Ibid., p x

[5] Ibid., p xi

[6] Ibid., p xii

[7] Ibid., p xii

The metropolitan areas in which the site cities are situated have been classified as areas of moderate unemployment, with unemployment rates of from 3.0 to 5.9 percent, for the past several years.[4] St. Clair County, Illinois, the county in which East St. Louis is situated, was found to have had an unemployment rate of 6.3 percent in 1964, and 6.0 percent in 1965.[5] In the St. Louis metropolitan area in 1965, unemployment was reported to be 3.4 percent.[6] In sum, within the metropolitan area of St. Louis, unemployment is markedly higher in St. Clair County, a component of the area. Within the central city of St. Louis, unemployment is markedly higher in the inner city and bears heavily on Negroes, young persons, and females. The same situation exists in East St. Louis, the central city of St. Clair County. Available statistical descriptions of the site cities, although increasingly

[1] Ibid.,p xii

[2] Ibid.,p 39

[3] Ibid., p xi

[4] See Area Trends in Employment and Unemployment, a monthly bulletin of the U.S. Employment Service. Cincinnati, Durham and St. Louis were classified in Group C, moderate unemployment, in September 1965, September 1966 and January 1967.

[5] St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 21, 1966, p 7A

[6] Ibid., Idem

out-of-date and not always focussed on the populations involved in these studies, indicate that each of the sites is experiencing the classic problems of the contemporary city. These problems revolve around suburbanization, inner-city joblessness, and race.

The Out-of-School Programs

In general, the NYC out-of-school programs in the four research sites had developed particular emphases that could be related to the development and organization of community resources.

Cincinnati is part of a large metropolitan area and appears to be relatively stable with respect to economic conditions and employment. The sponsoring agency for the NYC was established by the city government in 1957. Before the advent of Federal economic opportunity programs, this agency of the city government was developing programs to assist youths. Community resources for the NYC were thus operationally organized, and the program began with a wide base of civic support. Job development has received special emphasis in this site.

Durham, one-sixth the size of Cincinnati, is a growing southern city. Regional problems of progressive economic development led to the creation of the North Carolina Fund which stimulated the organization of a community action program in the site city. This agency, the local sponsor of NYC, was just becoming operational when the NYC began enrolling. Remedial education has received special emphasis in this site.

East St. Louis, about the same size as Durham, has been described as Appalachia in Illinois. Unemployment in this site is severe and long-standing. The Economic Opportunity Act provided the means for establishing the community action agency in this site. The NYC was the first opportunity program of this agency to become operational; and it has, in a sense, developed its own community supports. The program has emphasized the occupational content of work assignments.

St. Louis, the largest city of the four research sites, lies across the Mississippi from East St. Louis. Like the other large city, Cincinnati, St. Louis' response to problems associated with poverty was relatively structured and resulted in an organized base of community support for the NYC. The sponsoring agency in this site was organized in 1963, and developed from efforts to deal with the delinquency problems in the inner city. Although community concern with youth problems had structured these efforts, the field operations of the NYC in this site required additional organization of community resources. The program has emphasized a "reaching out" to other community agencies to provide a comprehensive program for enrollees.

The very earliest period of program operation in each site is reflected in these retrospective studies. Although each program was in its initial phase, however, each started from a different community baseline. Prior to the advent of the NYC, community concern in areas of NYC operation had already been structured to some extent in Cincinnati, Durham, and St. Louis. In East

St. Louis, on the other hand, the organization of community resources proceeded more or less simultaneously with the early operation of the NYC. Similarly, in the matter of work assignment locations, each program commenced with lists of resources representing the community's municipal, state, federal and non-private worksites.[1] At each site the NYC programs have moved to improve the quality and efficiency of work training and NYC administrators have found that large work sites offer many advantages. Most of the cities had at least one such site, often a state or federal hospital. Again, East St. Louis constituted an exception, but, by 1967, East St. Louis had developed work sites at two large federal agencies with consequent improvements in the work training experience provided by the program.

Local Neighborhood Youth Corps thus operate in complex and variable community environments, constituting a number of possible areas of program effort. Since all possible strategies of aid to out-of-school youth cannot be pursued equally and simultaneously at any given point in time, a program may appear to be emphasizing one area at the expense of other areas. The remedial education component of the NYC out-of-school program was, for example, most often supplied through special dropout programs in existing school systems; but, in Durham the NYC program developed its own remedial education program. The fact that the other NYC programs included in the study did not emphasize this area of possible program operation, however, probably reflects a priority given to other program components, e.g., job development in Cincinnati.

---

[1] 1966 amendments to the EOA authorized the Work Training in Industry program, enabling the inclusion of work training in non-public worksites.

NYC staff guiding enrollees were termed "counselors" in Cincinnati, Durham, and St. Louis, and "work advisors" in East St. Louis. These individuals provided the counseling component in the programs studied, and the area of their counsel tended to be related to the work assignment. Enrollees were assigned to their counselors on the basis of work station, and the counselors spent most of their time in assignment-related problems. Where circumstances permitted, other forms of counseling were developed. Group counseling sessions were instituted from time to time in several of the programs, and personal counseling services, both professional and lay, were sometimes present. The character of counseling service received by an enrollee was thus a matter of the emphasis of the particular NYC program, the work station and the counselor to whom the enrollee was assigned. Initial program proposals most often assigned both job counseling and job development to the Employment Service. The counseling reflected in the interview data, however, generally refers to the NYC staff member most closely in contact with the enrollee.

Of the four sites, Durham and St. Louis put the greatest emphasis on personal counseling. Durham counselors felt that adequate counseling required visiting the enrollee in his home and neighborhood. St. Louis' counselors assigned to the hospital work site found it possible to keep in close touch with the enrollees. In Cincinnati, on the other hand, counselors stationed at seven neighborhood centers were farther removed from the enrollees' work sites. Work advisors in East St. Louis put their initial emphasis on work rather than personal counseling. These differences in counseling philosophy and organization are reflected in the statistics reported in Section IV.

The Research Design

The goals of this research are to evaluate the effectiveness of NYC out-of-school programs in the four urban sites. The research design uses the employment record of the respondents as a criterion measure, quantifying the program's goal of increased employability of disadvantaged young persons. In addition to employment, the research design uses the social adjustment criterion as measured by number of police contacts. Holding a job and staying on the right side of the law, however, are only minimal statements of program goals and a measure of program effectiveness. In a larger sense, the program seeks to help its enrollees to become successfully functioning adults; and, similarly, the goal of this research is to evaluate the program's effectiveness in helping to achieve satisfactory adult adjustments. The process of becoming an adult--successful or unsuccessful--can extend well past an individual's 21st birthday. Measures of adjustment, furthermore, involve development and cannot be adequately reflected in data substantially limited in time. These considerations were recognized in the five-year longitudinal research design. In the overall research design, the retrospective studies reported here constitute a first step. As such, the studies produced, in addition to initial evaluative data, baseline data for subsequent studies; and they permitted the exploration of sampling methodologies suitable to the varied circumstances of the four site cities.

The two metropolitan sites operated NYC programs of over 1,000 enrollees, and had records of applicants who had not been enrolled. These circumstances permitted sampling procedures that were not feasible in the two smaller sites where the program level was less than 500 and non-enrolled applicants could not be identified. In Cincinnati, registrant and applicant lists were available at seven neighborhood centers. An Experimental sample was randomly selected through the fixed-interval method from the registrant lists; and, in the same way, a Control sample was selected from the applicant lists. These samples were geographically stratified through the location of the neighborhood centers. In St. Louis, the Experimental sample consisted of all enrollees assigned to a large agency, the State Hospital, and the Control sample was selected from unassigned applicants. In East St. Louis, the Experimental sample was composed of all enrollees in the last quarter of 1965 who lived in a defined area of the city. These subjects were matched by Control subjects identified through school records as similar in age, sex, dropout grade, school attended and area of residence. Similar procedures were employed in constituting the Durham samples except that a specified area of the city was not used as a selection variable.

Although sampling procedures varied between sites, each Experimental site sample was composed of young persons who were enrolled in the NYC out-of-school program in the fall and early winter of 1965-66. Control site samples were closely similar to Experimental site samples in terms of age, sex, and highest school grade completed but were dissimilar in that they lacked NYC experience. In each site the study samples numbered somewhat more than 100 subjects. The composite Experimental sample, comprised of Experimental subjects from all four sites, numbered 528 enrollees; and the composite Control sample, consisted of 524 individuals similar except for NYC experience.

III

THE STUDY SAMPLES

Interviewers familiar with the populations from which the samples were drawn completed interviews with 707 study subjects, or 67 percent of the combined Experimental and Control samples. The activity of an additional 7 percent of the subjects--away in military service, school, the Job Corps, or jail at the time of attempted interview--was ascertained from the families of these subjects. Criterion information was thus available for 74 percent of the subjects in the constituted study samples.

Interviewing disclosed that subsequent to the constitution of the Control sample, 20 percent of the Control subjects enrolled in the NYC. Although interviewed, these subjects were ineligible for the Control sample by virtue of their enrollment. At the conclusion of the interviewing process, the Experimental sample contained 438 subjects and the Control sample 238. Of these, full interviews were completed for 392 Experimental subjects and 205 Control subjects.[1]

The two samples matched closely on a number of variables (see Table 2). There were no statistically significant differences between the two samples in the percentages of Negro females and Negro males, subjects single at the time of interview, subjects in public housing, subjects in families receiving welfare assistance, subjects in the area and in the neighborhood for more than five years, subjects with vocational courses in school, and subjects with recorded police contacts prior to a date representing the beginning of

---

[1] See Appendix A for further description of sampling procedure.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF INTERVIEWED EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SUBJECTS ON SELECTED VARIABLES

Variable	Experimental Sample (N=392)	Control Sample (N=205)	CL[a]
	Percentage of Sample	Percentage of Sample	
Negro Female	62	59	ns
Negro Male	30	26	ns
White Male	6	11	.05
White Female	2	4	ns
Single	72	68	ns
Lives in Public Housing	15	12	ns
Family Receives Welfare Payments	25	23	ns
Lived in Present Area Over 5 years	87	82	ns
Lived in Present Neighborhood Over 5 Years	41	44	ns
Took Vocational Course in School	35	36	ns
Had Observable Physical Defect	10	5	.05
Had a Recorded Police Contact Prior to Registration Date[b]	28	32	ns
	Mean of Sample	Mean of Sample	
Age (as of February, 1967)	20.4	20.3	ns
Highest School Grade Completed	9.8	10.0	ns
Months Out of School at Registration Date[b]	17.4	14.3	.05
Number of Children	.8	.7	ns

---

[a] CL (Confidence Level) represents the degree of assurance that observed differences did not occur through chance. Exact probabilities are reported for CL's of .05 and less; that is, differences that could have occurred through chance less than 5 times in 100. The notation "ns" (not significant) indicates that, in the judgment of the author, the observed result should be attributed to chance. Ordinarily, ns" represents CL's greater than .05. In discussing confidence levels throughout this report, "significant refers to the .05 level; "very significant" to the .01 level and "highly significant" to the .001 level. To help avoid Type II errors notice is sometimes taken of probability levels which are between .05 and .25 when evidence from other sources suggests that they should be noted. Such levels are never referred to as significant but should be considered to represent a zone of suspended judgment with respect to the relationship being considered.

[b] In order to compare the two samples on this variable, a single date representing the inception of NYC experience in the Experimental sample in each site was used. This date is an average registration date.

NYC experience in the Experimental sample. The two samples were also substantially similar in mean age, highest school grade completed, and number of children.

A study subject in either the Experimental or the Control sample was more likely than not to be a Negro female, a long-time resident of the site area, a school dropout with a 10th grade education, and 20 years old when interviewed in the winter of 1967. In both samples, about one subject in seven lived in public housing, and about one subject in four was in a family receiving welfare assistance. About one third of the subjects in both samples had taken vocational courses in school, and about the same proportion had records of police contact prior to registration.

The two samples differed in their percentages of white males, of subjects with apparent physical defects, and in the mean number of months out of school before registration date. There were relatively more white males in the Control sample (11 percent as compared to 6 percent), and relatively fewer Control subjects had apparent physical defects (5 percent as compared with 10 percent). Control subjects had been out of school an average of 14 months, while Experimental subjects had been out of school an average of 17 months.

Additional data were secured in one site, Cincinnati, where intelligence test scores, days absent from school in last school year, academic performance in last school year and self-reported police contacts at registration permitted a closer comparison of the Experimental and Control samples (see Table 3). The two samples were closely similar in test scores, with an average I.Q. of slightly more than 80. Subjects in both samples averaged around six weeks' absence from school, and were poor-to-average students. Experimental subjects were slightly more apt to report police contacts. In general, however, the subjects in both samples grossly under-reported their police contacts: the average number of self-reported police contacts for all Cincinnati subjects was .2 whereas, the average number of recorded police contacts for these subjects was two.

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF INTERVIEWED EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SUBJECTS AT ONE RESEARCH SITE ON ADDITIONAL VARIABLES

Variable	Experimental Sample (N=95)	Control Sample (N=64)	CL
	Sample Mean	Sample Mean	
I.Q. Test Score[a]	82.4	83.9	ns
Days Absent from School During Last School Period	29.2	30.3	ns
Academic Performance During Last School Year[b]	1.3	1.4	ns
Self-reported Police Contacts at Registration Date	.3	.1	.05

[a] The Terman-McNemar test of mental ability was the most frequently used test although in a few instances, the Otis Quick Scoring Mental Ability Test, Lorge-Thorndike Test, and Stanford-Binet Scale were used. If more than one intelligence test score was recorded, the average was used.

[b] Based on review of school record - 1 = poor, 2 = average, 3 = good, 4 = very good.

It can be concluded that the two study samples were adequately matched for the purposes of this research. Some significant differences existed, however, in the respective subsamples. Negro female Experimental subjects had been out of school five months longer than the corresponding Control subjects; and male Experimental subjects had completed one-half a school grade less than corresponding Control subjects. Both of these differences were statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence. No significant differences were found between Negro and white males either within or between Experimental and Control samples. White females comprised so small a subsample as not to warrant a separate analysis.

In the Experimental sample, male and female subjects were found to differ significantly on a number of variables (see Table 4). Female subjects were older, had gone further in school, had been out of school longer, and had more children. Male subjects, on the other hand, were far more apt to have police records. In the closer inspection permitted by the more extensive Cincinnati data, female subjects averaged higher I.Q.'s, less absence from school, and better academic performance (see Table 5). All of these differences between male and female subjects were statistically significant and consistent with impressions of enrollees reported by researchers. In view of the significant sex-related differences in these basic variables, the data in subsequent sections of this report are presented according to the sex of the subject.

The final section of the interview form[1] secured impressions from the interviewer of the subject's appearance, speech, and approach.

[1] See Appendix B, pp 111-112.

TABLE 4

COMPARISON BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE SUBJECTS IN THE EXPERIMENTAL SAMPLE ON SELECTED VARIABLES

Variables	Males (N=140)	Females (N=252)	CL
Average Age (as of February 1,1967)	20.2	20.6	.05
Average Highest School Grade Completed	9.6	10.2	.01
Average Months Out of School at Registration Date	12.1	20.6	.01
Average Number of Children	.3	1.1	.001
Percent Having a Recorded Police Contact Prior to Registration Date	50%	18%	.001

TABLE 5

COMPARISON BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL SAMPLE AT ONE RESEARCH SITE ON ADDITIONAL VARIABLES

Variables	Males (N=48) Group Mean	Females (N=47) Group Mean	CL
I.Q. Test Scores	79.4	85.5	.05
Days Absent from School During Last School Year	36.3	23.3	.001
Academic Performance During Last School Year	1.2	1.5	.01
Self-Reported Police Contacts at Registration Date	.6	.0[a]	.001

[a] Less than .05

Experimental subjects were rated as more friendly and interested than Control subjects to a significant degree. Otherwise, there were no significant differences in the impressions made by Experimental and Control subjects. In the Experimental sample, several significant differences were apparent between male and female subjects (see Table 6). Female subjects impressed interviewers as, on the whole, speaking more clearly, fluently and with better grammar than male subjects. It is impossible to determine whether these differences in ratings made at the time of interview reflected differences existing at the time of the subjects' NYC enrollment, or whether the NYC experience had a differential effect on young men and women. The higher average school achievement of female subjects suggests that some of the differences probably existed at the time of NYC enrollment. In the prospective studies now underway, impressions are being secured at the time of NYC enrollment. The comparison of these impressions with those secured through follow-up interviews in the prospective study should indicate the extent to which these differences are characteristic.

TABLE 6

INTERVIEWERS' RATINGS OF MALE AND FEMALE SUBJECTS IN THE EXPERIMENTAL SAMPLE

Rated Element[a]	Male (N=140) Mean Rating	Female (N=252) Mean Rating	CL
Inappropriate dress-appropriate dress	4.0	3.9	ns
Dirty-clean	4.1	3.9	ns
Unkempt-neat	4.0	3.9	ns
Poor posture-good posture	3.9	3.8	ns
Unhealthy appearance-healthy appearance	4.2	4.1	ns
Awkward-poised	3.8	3.8	ns
Mumbles-speaks clearly	3.7	4.0	.01
Halting-fluent	3.6	3.8	.05
Ungrammatical-good grammar	3.5	3.8	.05
Heavy accent or dialect-standard speech	3.9	4.0	ns
Hostile-friendly	4.4	4.5	ns
Apathetic-interested	4.2	4.3	ns
Timid-confident	3.8	4.0	.10

[a] The elements were rated on a scale of 1 to 5 along the variable defined by the bi-polar adjectives. A rating of 5 was most favorable while a rating of 1 was least favorable.

IV

THE OUT-OF-SCHOOL NYC PROGRAMS

Section V of the interview form[1] produced enrollee descriptions of the out-of-school programs in the study sites. These descriptions, reviewed below, report characterizations of the program and indicate areas of local variation.

How Enrollees First Heard About the NYC

The most frequently reported source of first information about NYC was friends with NYC experience (see Table 7). Organized recruitment sources--the employment service or Youth Opportunity Center, NYC or school staff, and public media--were used significantly less often. The data from the Cincinnati study show that the tendency to depend upon friends for information was even more pronounced for Negroes than for whites. In this site, approximately 75 percent of the Negro subjects in the Experimental sample--as compared with 58 percent of the white Experimental subjects--reported that friends were their first source of information about the NYC. This difference is statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence.

[1] See Appendix B, pp 109-111.

TABLE 7

HOW ENROLLEES FIRST HEARD ABOUT THE NYC

Information source	Experimental sample Male (N=140)	Female (N=252)	Total (N=392)
		Percentages	
Friends in the NYC	47	49	48
Friends not in the NYC	7	6	6
Employment Service	9	7	8
Youth Opportunity Center	5	6	5
Neighborhood Center	2	4	3
NYC staff	5	5	5
School staff	8	4	5
Newspapers, radio, TV, posters, etc.	10	14	12
Other	7	7	7
Total[a]	100	102	99

[a] Percentages are rounded and consequently do not always total 100

The importance of peer-group communication to the reach of the NYC program is apparent from these responses. When it is recalled that all of these programs were in the first months of their operation, the speed and efficiency of peer-group communication are even more striking and indicate peer-group appreciation of the program, particularly appreciation from current or former enrollees.

NYC Work Assignments

Female enrollees most frequently reported NYC assignments as professional aides, while males most frequently reported assignments in cleaning and maintenance (see Table 8). Clerical work was the next most frequently reported female assignment, and work as a professional aide was the second most frequent male assignment. Together, these three broad categories of NYC assignment described 91 percent of the work assignments of female enrollees, and 77 percent of the assignments of males. The proportion of professional aide assignments was higher than might be expected because all of the work sites in St. Louis were in a hospital.

TABLE 8

OCCUPATIONAL CHARACTER OF NYC WORK ASSIGNMENTS[a]

Occupational Character	Males (N=140) Percentage	Females (N=252) Percentage	Total (N=392) Percentage
Professional Aide	19	56	43
Clerical	4	28	20
Food Preparation & Service	2	8	6
Structural Trades	3	0	1
Machine Trades	1	0	1
Repair Trades	1	0	0
Other Trades	1	0	0
Farming & Landscaping	3	0	1
Indoor Cleaning & Maintenance	45	7	20
Outdoor Cleaning & Maintenance	13	0	4
Unskilled Labor	5	1	3
Miscellaneous	3	0	1
Total	100	100	100

---

[a] See Appendix C for lists of jobs included in the above categories

The present study suggests strongly that the character of the reported NYC work assignment has more positive values for females than for males. This possibility will be discussed more fully in subsequent sections of this report. In the prospective studies now underway the relationship between the character of NYC assignments and subsequent employment in the world of work is being developed in greater detail.

Length of NYC Experience

Female enrollees tend to stay with NYC longer: relatively more females were still active enrollees and their time with NYC averaged 8.4 months as compared with the male average of 6.9 months (see Table 9). This difference was significant at the .01 level of confidence. Most of this difference was accounted for by the larger proportion of the males leaving the program after less than a three-month enrollment. Thirty-three percent of the males stayed three months or less as compared to 18 percent of the females.

Substantial differences were found among the different programs with respect to length of enrollment. For example, 54 percent of the males in Durham and 43 percent of the males in East St. Louis left during the first three months as compared to only 19 percent of the males in both Cincinnati and St. Louis. The information necessary to evaluate the meaning of these figures was not available from the retrospective study. The relationship between length of enrollment and the achievement of NYC objectives will be probed more deeply during the prospective study.

TABLE 9

LENGTH OF NYC EXPERIENCE

Months in the NYC	Male (N=140) Percentage	Female (N=252) Percentage	Total (N=392) Percentage
0-3 months	33	18	24
4-6 months	22	26	24
7-9 months	20	17	18
10-12 months	11	21	17
13-15 months	5	8	7
16-18 months	5	6	6
19 months, or more	4	3	4
Total	100	99	100
Average number of months	6.9	8.4	7.9
Percent of subsample currently enrolled in NYC	16	30	25

The research design for this study was based on the assumption that the standard enrollment period was six months. Slightly over half of the enrollees stayed longer than six months and 25 percent of the interviewed subjects were still enrolled at the time of the interview. It should also be noted that enrollees frequently terminate and then reapply; therefore, the period of time enrolled in NYC does not necessarily represent a continuous enrollment.

Enjoyment of NYC Work

At the conclusion of the reconnaissance phase of this project, investigators predicted that program satisfactions would be greater for females than for males. Enrollee responses to interview questions regarding various aspects of the NYC work experience generally support this prediction, although males as well as females tended to give the programs a high rating.

About two-thirds of the Experimental subjects reported that they enjoyed their NYC work "very much" (see Table 10). Far more of the female enrollees (73 percent) than of the males (45 percent) gave this highest report of enjoyment--a difference significant at the .001 level of confidence. Relatively more of the males, however, reported that they enjoyed the work "somewhat". The great majority of enrollees, both male and female, thus reported enjoyment of the work, but female enrollees reported greater enjoyment.

TABLE 10

ENJOYMENT OF NYC WORK

Enrollee enjoyed work	Male (N=140) Percentage	Female (N=252) Percentage	Total (N=392) Percentage
Very much	45	73	64
Somewhat	38	20	26
Not much	8	4	6
Not at all	9	2	5
Total	100	99	101
Average[a]	3.19	3.65	3.49

[a] Computed by giving values to the above categories ranging from 1 for "not at all" to 4 for "very much".

Importance of NYC Work

The enrollees as a group gave a high rating to the importance of their work, 4.2 on a five-point scale. Females rated their work very significantly higher than did males (see Table 11). No significant differences were found among the research sites.

TABLE 11

IMPORTANCE OF NYC WORK

	Male (N=140)	Female (N=252)	Total (N=392)
Mean Rating[a]	3.9	4.3	4.2

[a] The scale values have been reversed from the order shown on the interview schedule.

Closeness of Supervision

About two out of five enrollees reported that they were "very closely" supervised on their NYC work, and about the same proportion reported that they were "fairly closely" supervised (see Table 12). Unlike the reports of enjoyment and importance of NYC work, reports of the closeness of supervision indicated substantial similarity between male and female enrollees.

TABLE 12

CLOSENESS OF SUPERVISION

Closeness of Supervision	Male (N=140) Percentage	Female (N=252) Percentage	Total (N=392) Percentage
Very closely	47	40	42
Fairly closely	36	40	38
Somewhat	15	19	18
Not supervised	2	2	2
Total	100	101	100

Helpfulness of Supervisor

Roughly three out of five enrollees reported their work supervisor to have been 'very helpful' (see Table 13). Again, enrollee reports of the work experience gave a high rating to this program element, and, again, there was no significant difference between male and female enrollees.

TABLE 13

HELPFULNESS OF SUPERVISOR

Rating	Male (N=140)	Female (N=252)	Total (N=392)
	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage
Very helpful	60	65	63
Fairly helpful	21	20	20
A little helpful	12	8	10
Not helpful at all	6	5	5
A hindrance	2	2	2
Total	101	100	100

Friendliness of Fellow-Workers

Most enrollees reported that their fellow-workers were "very friendly," but males were significantly more apt to report this than were females (see Table 14). Here, the direction of the difference was the reverse of that found in reports of enjoyment and importance of work, where it will be recalled, females gave higher ratings than males. Taken together, these responses thus suggest that, in the various aspects of work experience probed by the interview, female enrollees tended to give a higher rating to the occupational aspects; whereas, male enrollees tended to give a higher rating to the social setting of NYC work.

TABLE 14

FRIENDLINESS OF FELLOW-WORKERS

Rating	Male (N=140) Percentage	Female (N=252) Percentage	Total (N=392) Percentage
Very friendly	81	67	71
Fairly friendly	17	28	24
A little friendly	2	3	3
Not friendly at all	1	1	1
Openly hostile	0	1	1
Total	101	100	100

Usefulness of NYC Work

In an effort to get a comprehensive rating of work experience, Experimental subjects were asked to rate it on a five-point scale running from "waste of time" to "extremely useful." Enrollees gave a high average rating (4.2) to the usefulness of NYC work (see Table 15). Although male enrollees gave the program a high average rating (4.0), their rating was significantly lower than the average rating by female enrollees (4.3).

TABLE 15

USEFULNESS OF NYC WORK

	Male (N=140)	Female (N=252)	Total (N=392)
Mean rating	4.0	4.3	4.2

Frequency of Counselor Meeting

The average enrollee met with his counselor about once a week, and no significant differences were found between males and females (see Table 16). The Cincinnati subjects reported the least frequent meetings with counselor and the St. Louis subjects, the most. It should be noted there is no correlation between the number of times the enrollee met with his counselor and his overall rating of the usefulness of the program. It may be that the counselors met more often with the more troublesome enrollees or enrollees who were making the poorest adjustment to the program as well as working with other enrollees on particular problems.

TABLE 16

FREQUENCY OF COUNSELOR MEETING

Frequency	Male (N=140)	Female (N=252)	Total (N=392)
	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage
More than once a week	20	24	23
About once a week	47	44	45
About once a month	11	18	16
Less than once a month	14	8	10
Not at all	5	5	5
Didn't (don't) have a counselor	2	1	1
Total	99	100	100

Helpfulness of Counselor

About 60 percent of the enrollees considered their counselors to be very helpful and no significant differences were found between the sexes (see Table 17). Durham and St. Louis subjects of both sexes reported the counselors to be most helpful and Cincinnati and East St. Louis subjects reported the counselors to be least helpful. At all four sites, at least 50 percent of the subjects reported the counselors to be very helpful.

TABLE 17

HELPFULNESS OF COUNSELOR

Rating	Male (N=140) Percentage	Female (N=252) Percentage	Total (N=392) Percentage
Very helpful	56	62	60
Fairly helpful	21	20	20
A little helpful	13	9	11
Not helpful at all	8	8	8
A hindrance	2	1	1
Total	100	100	100
Average	4.2	4.3	4.3

Most Useful Aspects of NYC Experience

Learning job skills, learning work habits, money, and help in getting a job were the most frequently mentioned aspects of NYC experience which the enrollees considered to be useful (see Table 18). Counseling and class-room work were mentioned much less frequently. Girls mentioned each of these categories more frequently than boys.

TABLE 18

MOST USEFUL ASPECTS OF NYC EXPERIENCE[a]

Aspect of NYC Experience	Male (N=140) Percentage	Female (N=252) Percentage	Total (N=392) Percentage
Learning work habits	40	45	43
Learning job skills	36	52	46
Class-room work	8	17	14
Counseling	12	20	17
Help getting a job	29	40	36
Money	37	46	43
Other	0	1	1
Nothing	3	1	2

[a] More than one category could be selected by the subjects

NYC Help in Getting a Job

By a ratio of about three to one, enrollees report that NYC experience has or will help them get a job (see Table 19). Female enrollees expressed significantly more confidence (83 percent) than male enrollees (66 percent). This difference between male and female enrollees is consistent with the finding that the NYC actually locates relatively more jobs for female enrollees. Even though an appreciable portion of the Experimental sample was still actively enrolled in the NYC at the time of interview, the relatively higher confidence of female enrollees in NYC job-placement help seems well-founded.

A comparison of sites shows that Cincinnati and St. Louis subjects report the most confidence in the help which was or will be given them by NYC in obtaining a job. These findings are probably a reflection of the energetic job development program in Cincinnati and the job opportunities available at the hospital work-site in St. Louis for qualified enrollees. The female subjects in Durham are almost as confident as the females in the above two sites, but the males are significantly more pessimistic. East St. Louis is the only site in which a majority of the subjects say they do not think that NYC experience has or will help them get a job. This is probably a reflection of the bleak employment opportunities in this city.

TABLE 19

NYC HELP IN GETTING A JOB

Rating	Male (N=140) Percentage	Female (N=252) Percentage	Total (N=392) Percentage
Yes	66	83	77
No	34	17	23
Total	100	100	100

Disliked Aspects of NYC

Almost half of the enrollees said they had no dislikes and about 20 percent did not respond to the question (see Table 20). The responses of those who did list dislikes were scattered over a wide range of topics.

TABLE 20

MOST DISLIKED ASPECTS OF NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Disliked Aspect	Male (N=140) Percentage	Female (N=252) Percentage	Total (N=392) Percentage
Nothing	45	46	46
Everything	2	0	1
Money	13	7	9
Counselors	1	4	3
Type of work	2	2	2
Class-room work	0	1	1
Other	14	24	20
No response	24	16	19
Total	101	100	101

SUMMARY

Enrollees' reports of their NYC experience should encourage program administrators in several ways. In the program areas probed by the interview, enrollees predominantly gave high ratings to the NYC. Their favorable reports of the NYC imply that the program can stimulate and maintain the participation of enrollees. In view of the significance of peer-group communication, this augurs well for the future reach of the program. Although both male and female enrollees gave high ratings, female enrollees repeatedly averaged significantly higher ratings. In view of the gravity of unemployment among disadvantaged young women, these findings indicate that the NYC program is meeting an important need.

It is of interest that enrollees valued the program in an employment context. Both male and female Experimental subjects singled out aspects of the work assignment for mention as most useful, and occupational preparation--learning job skills or work habits--received widespread appreciation. Enrollees performed a variety of tasks. Girls most frequently were assigned to professional aide or clerical work and boys most frequently were assigned to cleaning and maintenance jobs. The unskilled character of a majority of assignments for male enrollees may be one of the reasons for the generally lower rating given the program by males.

The average time spent in the program was about eight months with 25 percent of the sample still enrolled. Females stay significantly longer than males. In response to a question about their dislikes, about half of the Experimental subjects said there was nothing they disliked about the program. The most frequent complaint, amount of money earned, was expressed by 10 percent of the sample. By a ratio of better than three to one, enrollees said they thought the NYC experience had helped or would help them get a job.

V

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

In the long run, the effectiveness of NYC programs will be gauged by their contribution to the successful adult functioning of former enrollees. The retrospective study reported here covers too short a time span to support conclusions concerning lasting program achievements: study subjects were predominantly pre-adult; and, at the time of interview, one-fourth of the Experimental subjects were still active NYC enrollees while many more had been terminated from the NYC for only a few months. This report thus can provide only preliminary indications of program effectiveness.

In analyzing the results of the interviewing, successful functioning has been operationally defined as the ability to hold a job, to continue preparation for future employment, to discharge military obligations, and to act as a responsible member of society. It was hypothesized that the NYC has helped its enrollees to be successful in these terms.

Current Activity

By making use of information obtained from close relatives or friends, as well as information obtained from completed interviews, the activity of 438 Experimental subjects and 238 Control subjects at the time of interview was ascertained. A significant difference was found between the Experimental and Control subjects in the percentage of unemployment among females but not among males. About 50 percent of the female subjects in the Control sample were unemployed at the time of the interview as compared to about 25 percent of the female Experimental subjects. Table 21 lists these data by labor force status and Table 22 by type of outcome. Male subjects in the two study samples were closely similar in the extent of their unemployment. It is interesting that the 11 percent of the male Experimental subjects still enrolled in the NYC was balanced by the higher percentage of Control males who were in the military service. This situation may result from relatively more enlistments in the Control sample or from relatively more physical disqualifications in the Experimental sample.

TABLE 21

ACTIVITY AT TIME OF INTERVIEW LISTED BY LABOR FORCE STATUS

Activity	Experimental Sample			Control Sample		
	Male (N=178)	Female (N=260)	Total (N=438)	Male (N=105)	Female (N=133)	Total (N=238)
	Percentage			Percentage		
Total in labor force	86	87	86	86	77	81
In civilian labor force	77	87	82	62	77	70
Employed	48	59	54	33	24	28
In NYC	11	31	23	0	0	0
Outside NYC	37	28	31	33	24	28
Unemployed	29	28	28	29	53	42
In military labor force	9	0	4	24	0	11
Total not in labor force	14	13	14	15	23	19
Housewife	0	9	5	0	12	7
School	1	3	2	3	7	5
Job Corps	3	0	2	3	1	2
Training programs	2	1	2	4	1	2
Jail	6	0	2	5	0	2
Other	2	0	1	0	2	1
Total population	100	100	100	101	100	100

TABLE 22

ACTIVITY AT TIME OF INTERVIEW
LISTED BY TYPE OF OUTCOME

Activity	Experimental Sample			Control Sample		
	Male (N=178)	Female (N=260)	Total (N=438)	Male (N=105)	Female (N=133)	Total (N=238)
	Percentage			Percentage		
Employed in NYC	11	31	23	0	0	0
Employed Outside NYC	37	28	31	33	24	28
In Military Service	9	0	4	24	0	11
Returned to school	1	3	2	3	7	5
In Job Corps	3	0	2	3	1	2
In other training programs	2	1	2	4	1	2
Sub total	63	63	64	67	33	48
Unemployed	29	28	28	29	53	42
Housewife	0	9	5	0	12	7
In Jail	6	0	2	5	0	2
Other	2	0	1	0	2	1
Total	100	100	100	101	100	100

Since 31 percent of the female Experimental sample are still enrolled in the NYC program, it is too early to come to any definite conclusion about the degree to which NYC experience increases the employability of disadvantaged females. Limiting the consideration to subjects in the female Experimental sample that have left the program, approximately 41 percent are unemployed. This percentage is significantly lower than the percentage of unemployed in the female Control sample. The data thus suggest that the alternative to NYC for this group is likely to be unemployment.

Routes to Employment

The NYC served its enrollees by helping them find employment. Approximately one-third of the Experimental subjects with post-NYC employment experience reported that they heard about their most recent jobs through the NYC (See Table 23). Female subjects reported NYC as a job locater about twice as often as male subjects, reflecting again the greater effectiveness of the program for this group. In Cincinnati, probably because of its job development focus, the NYC helped three-fourths of the females with post-NYC employment experience get their most recent jobs. It is of interest that in Cincinnati and St. Louis some subjects in the Control sample also heard about their most recent employment through the NYC.

TABLE 23

SOURCE THROUGH WHICH YOUTH FIRST HEARD ABOUT HIS MOST RECENT JOB

Source	Experimental Sample			Control Sample		
	Male (N=110)	Female (N=149)	Total (N=259)	Male (N=75)	Female (N=79)	Total (N=159)
	Percentage			Percentage		
Employment Service	11	10	10	12	5	8
Private employment agency	0	0	0	0	1	1
School	1	1	1	3	1	2
Friends or relatives	52	34	42	51	46	48
Previous employer	1	0	1	4	1	2
Advertisements	4	7	6	8	11	10
NYC	21	43	33	3	10	7
Other	10	6	7	19	24	22
Total	100	101	100	100	99	100

Youth Occupations

At the time of the interview the majority of subjects in both the Experimental and Control groups had been employed outside of the NYC program. The principal difference between the two samples was the significantly larger percentage of professional aide jobs reported by subjects in the Experimental sample.

TABLE 24

OCCUPATIONAL CHARACTER OF MOST RECENT NON-NYC EMPLOYMENT

Occupation	Experimental Group			Control Group		
	Male (N=94)	Female (N=124)	Total (N=218)	Male (N=64)	Female (N=54)	Total (N=118)
	Percentage			Percentage		
Clerical and sales	14	35	26	27	26	26
Food services	18	18	18	13	39	25
Cleaning and maintenance	15	10	12	9	6	8
Unskilled labor	11	7	9	17	6	12
Construction worker	4	0	2	2	0	1
Mechanic, craftsman, or machine operator	23	3	12	23	9	17
Professional aide	9	26	18	5	13	8
Other	6	0	3	5	2	3
Total	100	99	100	101	101	100

Female subjects in the Experimental sample were significantly more likely to have clerical or sales jobs or jobs as professional aides, than were female subjects in the Control sample. Male subjects in the Experimental sample were significantly less apt to have clerical or sales jobs than were male subjects in the Control sample. Identical percentages of male subjects in both samples had jobs in trades, and relatively more of the male subjects in the Experimental sample had jobs in food service and cleaning and maintenance.

The tendency of enrollees to find employment in the occupational areas of their NYC work experience was more apparent in some sites than in others. A majority of the female subjects in the Experimental samples in Cincinnati and East St. Louis, for example, reported both employment and NYC experience in the clerical field; and, in St. Louis, almost half of the female subjects reported employment and NYC experience as nurses' aides. In Durham, on the other hand, two-thirds of the employment reported by female subjects in the Experimental sample was in food service or cleaning and maintenance; yet, as enrollees, 87 percent of this subsample had worked as professional aides. These variations among sites may reflect differential skills acquired prior to enrollment, differential employment opportunities, as well as the character of NYC program emphasis at the various sites.

Earnings

The average hourly earnings of subjects reporting employment in the Experimental sample amounted to $1.47, and the comparable average in the Control sample was $1.46 (see Table 25). In both samples, female subjects reported significantly lower earnings than did male subjects.

TABLE 25

AVERAGE HOURLY EARNINGS, MOST RECENT NON-NYC EMPLOYMENT

	Experimental Sample			Control Sample		
	Male (N=102)	Female (N=131)	Total (N=233)	Male (N=60)	Female (N=66)	Total (N=126)
Average hourly earnings	1.67	1.31	1.47	1.73	1.21	1.46

Principal Source of Support

Female subjects in the Experimental sample depended upon their own earnings, including those from NYC, far more frequently than did females in the Control sample (see Table 26). This greater self-dependence, together with the lower percentage of unemployment in the female Experimental subsample, provides strong evidence that the NYC experience improves the adjustment of disadvantaged young women. No differences were found between the male samples.

TABLE 26

PRINCIPAL SOURCE OF SUPPORT
TIME OF INTERVIEW

Source	Experimental Sample Male (N=140)	Experimental Sample Female (N=252)	Experimental Sample Total (N=392)	Control Sample Male (N=77)	Control Sample Female (N=128)	Control Sample Total (N=205)
	Percentage			Percentage		
Earnings	59	44	49	58	23	36
Unemployment compensation	0	0[a]	0[a]	0	1	1
Welfare	6	13	10	9	16	13
Family	30	17	22	29	28	28
Spouse	1	19	13	1	24	15
Training	2	0[a]	1	1	0	1
Other	2	6	5	2	8	6
Total	100	99	100	100	100	100

[a] Less than .5

Police Contacts

In addition to the positive adjustments to the community explored through employment data, the study explored maladjustments through police data. At two of the research sites, Cincinnati and Durham, the evidence indicated that a significant reduction was accomplished in police contacts for enrollees compared to their controls.[1] At the other research sites, no comparable reduction in police contacts was found. It should be noted that Durahm and Cincinnati were the communities with the most highly developed youth assistance programs. The subjects also rated these programs higher with respect to overall usefulness than did the subjects in St. Louis and East St. Louis. The data are too ambiguous to permit definite conclusions but it seems reasonable to assume that both the East St. Louis and the St. Louis programs, after a longer period of operation, will show a reduction in police contacts similar to that of the better established programs. This assumption will be tested through the prospective study currently under way.

When the data from all sites were combined, a small, but statistically significant, difference was found indicating that female enrollees had relatively fewer police contacts after the date of NYC enrollment than the controls. No significant difference was found between the male sub-samples.

Academic and Vocational Preparation

While community and work adjustment are the basic evaluative criteria used for this study, there are intervening steps which often must be taken before the individual can perform adequately in an adult role in society. The youth of the Experimental and Control samples were, for the most part, poorly prepared for successful work adjustment with respect to academic and vocational skills. As a group, they need further training and education and a measure of their progress is the extent to which they attend night school or vocational education classes after leaving full-time school.

---

[1] The detailed reports of the studies of police contacts are appended as follows: Appendix D, Cincinnati; and Appendix E, Durham.

About 45 percent of the Experimental subjects as compared with more than 25 percent of the Control subjects had attended some type of academic or vocational education class after leaving school (see Table 27). While significantly more females than males reported supplemental education, both males and females in the Experimental sample had enrolled in classes since dropping out of school significantly more than boys and girls in the Control sample. The most dramatic achievement in this regard was in Durham where 63 percent of the male subjects in the Experimental sample, as compared with nine percent of the male subjects in the Control sample, reported supplemental education. The results from Durham indicate that with an effective remedial education component, both males and females continue their education.

TABLE 27

EDUCATION SINCE DROPPING OUT OF SCHOOL

Education	Experimental Sample			Control Sample		
	Male (N=140)	Female (N=252)	Total (N=392)	Male (N=77)	Female (N=128)	Total (N=205)
		Percentage			Percentage	
Continued Education						
Night school or vocational education courses	39	49	44	12	28	21
Returned to school full-time	1	3	2	3	7	5
No continued education	60	48	54	85	65	74
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

In the long run, by continuing their education, subjects in the Experimental sample should improve their employability. In the meantime, these data indicate that the NYC out-of-school programs may be stimulating participation in additional education.

Attitude Change

There is much persuasive evidence[1] that an individual's self concept importantly influences how well he adjusts to his life situation. The self concepts of the study subjects can thus be presumed to be related to the work and community adjustment variables. Providing adequate measuring procedures could be developed in this area, furthermore, indexes of self concept might provide, in themselves, gauges of program effect.

Several items in the interview form--the subject's occupational goal, his estimation of goal achievement, and the interviewer's rating of the realism of the goal sought to measure the subject's self concept. For the most part, there was very little difference in the nature of the occupational goals of subjects in the two samples (see Table 28). Female subjects in the Experimental sample, however, were very much more apt to have professional or sub-professional goals than were subjects in other subsamples. Nearly half of the female enrollees, as compared with 17 percent of the male enrollees, 35 percent of the female subjects in the Control sample, and 12 percent of the males in the Control sample, had goals as professionals or as professional aides. This result strongly suggests that the NYC is changing the aspiration of female enrollees.

---

[1] Ruth C. Wylie, The Self Concept: A Critical Survey of Pertinent Research Literature. University of Nebraska Press (Lincoln, Nebraska) 1961.

TABLE 28

OCCUPATIONAL GOALS

Goals	Experimental Sample			Control Sample		
	Male (N=140)	Female (N=252)	Total (N=392)	Male (N=77)	Female (N=128)	Total (N=205)
	Percentage			Percentage		
Clerical and sales	4	28	20	4	27	18
Food Service	0	2	1	3	3	3
Cleaning and maintenance	1	0	1	3	0	1
Mechanic, craftsman, or machine operator	42	5	18	33	8	18
Managerial	1	0	1	4	0	1
Professional	12	36	27	11	26	20
Professional aide	5	13	10	1	9	6
Other	12	4	7	14	3	7
Money	4	2	3	4	1	2
Marriage	1	4	3	0	11	7
No goals or unknown	17	6	10	25	11	17
Total	99	100	101	102	99	100

About the same percentages of subjects in both samples were fairly optimistic about their chances of achieving their occupational goals (see Table 29). There were no appreciable differences between the sexes. In the Experimental sample, 79 percent of the subjects thought their chances to be "excellent" or "reasonably good," while the comparable Control percentage was 75 percent.

TABLE 29

YOUTHS' ESTIMATES OF ACHIEVING OCCUPATIONAL GOALS

Estimate	Experimental Sample			Control Sample		
	Male (N=140)	Female (N=252)	Total (N=392)	Male (N=77)	Female (N=128)	Total (N=205)
	Percentage			Percentage		
Excellent	16	18	18	19	18	19
Reasonably good	62	61	61	57	56	56
Slight	17	15	15	16	18	18
Unlikely	5	6	6	7	7	7
Total	100	100	100	99	99	100

In general, having an occupational goal and being optimistic about achieving it are favorable indications of successful community adjustment. At the same time, if the goal is unrealistically high or low, the self-confidence implied in its achievement may, in fact, be over-confidence or lack of self-confidence. Some measure of the realistic nature of the subjects' goals was attempted by having the interviewers rate this item. There was little difference between the study samples in terms of the realistic nature of occupational goals. The great majority of goals in both samples were judged to be realistic (see Table 30). Although the interviewers found no appreciable difference between male subjects in the two samples a significant difference was found between females. More females in the Experimental sample (75 percent) than in the Control sample (66 percent) had goals that the interviewers thought to be "reasonable."

TABLE 30

INTERVIEWERS' RATINGS OF
OCCUPATIONAL GOALS

Rating	Experimental Sample			Control Sample		
	Male (N=140)	Female (N=252)	Total (N=392)	Male (N=77)	Female (N=128)	Total (N=205)
	Percentage			Percentage		
Low	17	9	12	15	18	17
Reasonable	74	75	74	72	66	69
Unrealistically high	10	16	14	13	15	15
Total	101	100	100	100	99	101

Distinguishing Characteristics of "Successful" Enrollees

The variables associated with successful community adjustment were investigated through a comparison of "successful" and "unsuccessful" terminated enrollees. For the purpose of this comparison, a terminated enrollee was counted "successful" if (1) he was employed at the time of interview, (2) his earnings were more than $1.25 an hour, and (3) he had been in his job at least two months. A terminated enrollee was counted "unsuccessful" if (1) he was unemployed at the time of interview, and (2) he was dependent on his family or on welfare for support. Enrollees not in the civilian labor force were excluded from consideration.

In each of the four research sites, the group of "successful" Experimental subjects was significantly higher in school grade completed than the "unsuccessful" group. There was some indication, also, that "success" was associated with maturity in that "successful" groups were older, on the average, than "unsuccessful" groups. Comparison of the two groups disclosed no differences in terms of race, sex, length of NYC experience, or amount of police contact prior to NYC enrollment. Although the results of this comparison were not illuminating with respect to program effect, similar comparisons of future data should provide insight into areas of significant program effect.

SUMMARY

Based on the criteria of work and community adjustment, the data from this study indicate that female enrollees made greater gains than did the males. The most significant improvement for the male Experimental subjects was their greater participation in academic or vocational education after leaving school as compared to their Controls. Female Experimental subjects also attended more educational or vocational classes, and they also were less likely to be unemployed, had fewer police contacts, and more were likely to be self-supporting than their Controls. With respect to the adjustment criteria of unemployment and police contact, there were no significant differences between male subjects in the two samples.

Female subjects in the Experimental sample were more apt to be employed in clerical and sales work, or as professional aides, than were female subjects in the Control sample. Since most NYC work assignments for female enrollees were clerical or professional aide, the jobs held by young women with NYC experience generally reflected the occupational character of their NYC work. The same relationship between NYC work experience and later employment was not found for male enrollees, perhaps due to the unskilled nature of many of the NYC work assignments of males.

VI

IMPLICATIONS

The data from this study provide substantial evidence that the out-of-school NYC programs at the four research sites have enrolled seriously disadvantaged youths, particularly among males, and are improving the work and community adjustment of participating youth. The enrollees interviewed report a high level of satisfaction with their NYC experience--with the usefulness of their work, the helpfulness of their supervisors and counselors, and the friendliness of their fellow workers. Compared to young persons in the Control group, youth with NYC experience had more supplemental and remedial education, and were more frequently employed and self-supporting. Police contacts were significantly reduced at two of the sites following NYC enrollment. The time that enrollees have been exposed to the requirements of full-time regular jobs is still too short for firm conclusions to be reached, but there is no reason to believe that the trends found in this study will not continue as more outcome experience is accumulated.

These interview results provided evidence of program effectiveness; but, at the same time, they pointed to problem areas in the program. For example, the studied programs did not appear to be as effective with males or white females as they were with Negro females; and rates of unemployment remained high among ex-enrollees. There were too few white females in the sample for any separate statistical analysis of this group. This small number may be due to the lack of need; that is, white females may be able to find jobs without assistance. Alternatively, it may be due to recruiting practices or to the image projected by NYC to this group.

Evidence that white females do not need as much help as other groups is provided by a March 1966 study showing that the unemployment rate was 46 percent for non-white girls and 31 percent for non-white boys aged 14 to 19 in poverty areas o of the country's major cities. Unemployment rates for white teenagers in these areas were much lower (10 percent for girls and 20 percent for boys).[1] The few white females who did apply for the NYC program had dropped out of school at an earlier grade, had been out of school longer, were more pessimistic about their chances of achieving their occupational goals, and were given a lower rating by the interviewer on their appearance, speech and approach than were Negro females. While these differences were statistically significant, the number of subjects was so small, that it is hazardous to draw definite conclusions. The possibility should be considered, however, that there may be other disadvantaged white females who could benefit from the NYC program but who are not applying. If this turns out to be the case, consideration should be given to ways for effectively involving them in the program. To a lesser degree, the same questions can be raised with respect to white males.

It seems probable that part of the explanation for the favorable finding with respect to Negro females is that they are easier to work with than are males; they have more interest in improving themselves, and they have a more difficult time obtaining job training or job placement without assistance. On the average, female enrollees were found to be better educated than males, had fewer contacts with police, and impressed the interviewers as being more interested in the interview and as having better speech in terms of clarity, fluency, and grammatical correctness. A factor contributing to the poorer results with males may be the character of work assignments most frequently reported by male enrollees, maintenance and unskilled labor. Such assignments may offer limited opportunities for on-the-job training. The NYC program might have a more positive effect on males if a greater variety of NYC jobs with more career potential could be developed for them. Although youth in the Experimental group had relatively less unemployment than those in the Control group, 28% of the Experimental subjects were unemployed at the time of their interview. The percentage of unemployment increased to 38% when subjects still enrolled in the NYC were excluded. The comparable percentage for the Control group was 42%. It must be concluded that the NYC experience was a substantial factor in reducing unemployment, but it also must be recognized that the program's work adjustment objectives have not yet been fully realized.

---

[1] Manpower Report of the President, (Washington, D.C.: U.S.Government Printing Office, April, 1967) p 77.

Three of the studied programs have had noteworthy success which can have important implications for other programs. Cincinnati with its energetic job development program has shown what can be done to help enrollees find jobs. Durham with its imaginative approach to remedial education has demonstrated that even male school drop-outs, properly motivated, will make the effort to improve their verbal and computational skills. St. Louis through its hospital work site has shown that direct training on the job in job skills which can be used at the work site, such as nursing aid in the case of a hospital, facilitates the employment of the enrollees. It is too much to expect any one program to emphasize all program elements equally and, therefore, important that communication channels be maintained whereby one program can learn from the successes of another.

Even at this early stage in the research, the results raise policy issues to be considered by program administrators and suggest areas needing further research exploration. Several of the more important issues are discussed below.

Job Development

Public employment agencies have developed programs, such as the YOC, designed specifically to help disadvantaged groups, but our research results suggest that they may not yet be giving substantial assistance to the types of youth enrolled in the NYC program. For example, only about 10% of the subjects in our sample said that they first heard of their most recent job through these agencies.

There seems to be an inevitable conflict between the point of view of public and private employment agencies and the NYC stemming from different criteria for judging program success. The number of successful placements has been the traditional standard against which an employment agency has judged its performance. The employer becomes the most important client to be satisfied and the best way to satisfy him is to send qualified candidates for all job openings. When poorly qualified candidates are sent, the employer may stop using the employment agency for recruitment. Under these circumstances, there may be a tendency for employment counselors to be reluctant to refer the typical out-of-school enrollee for a job since such youth are frequently employment risks. On the other hand, the NYC should judge its success by the number of youth it can place successfully into jobs. Its client becomes the youth himself. Risks have to be taken: the eventual adjustment of the youth to the world of work is more important than the job failures which may occur while the youth is learning to make this adjustment.

In the absence of effective job placement programs, the local NYC administrators may have no alternative to doing their own job development. Cincinnati, as we indicated above, has an energetic program of locating jobs and opening up employment opportunities; and, as a result, 48 percent of the subjects in the Experimental sample at this site reported that they first heard about their most recent job through the NYC. Another effective technique is to assign enrollees to jobs which can lead to full-time employment. As an example, subjects in the Experimental sample in St. Louis had all been assigned to a hospital work-site, and about 40 percent of the ex-enrollees who were employed at the time of interview were performing work similar to that performed as enrollees.

Job Corps

The vocational training program most closely paralleling the NYC is the Job Corps. Our observations indicated that there is little formal coordination between these two programs. Individual counselors may, through their own efforts, work out informal cooperative relationships which permit some type of coordination but we found this to be unusual. On a number of occasions we asked NYC counselors what they would do if they had an enrollee who was functioning very poorly at home and needed the kind of controlled environment which was possible in a Job Corps camp. In most cases, the counselors indicated that while they knew what the application procedures were, they had no confidence that admission could be arranged within any reasonable period time or, for that matter, that admission could be arranged at all. These relationships were reflected in our data in that we found less than five percent of our sample had ever enrolled in the Job Corps.

The NYC and the Job Corps are working with similar populations and are attempting to solve similar kinds of problems. The NYC works with youths in the community and provides comparatively limited services. The Job Corps moves the youth from his community, and provides comprehensive services. At the time our samples were selected, the decision as to whether the youth should be enrolled in the Job Corps or in the Neighborhood Youth Corps appeared to be based on chance factors rather than on judgment as to whether he would do better in the community or benefit more from getting away from home. These considerations suggest a need for coordinating NYC and Job Corps assignment policies and for determining through research which youths need Job Corps experience and which ones can be trained best in their own community. Otherwise, some youths may be sent away from home at considerable cost to the Government when their problems could be more economically and effectively dealt with at home. On the other hand, there are other youths who need to get away from their home environment and can be expected to profit from Job Corps training.

MDTA

The MDTA (Manpower Development and Training Act) including its OJT (On-the-job Training) aspects is an alternative program theoretically available to NYC enrollees for vocational skill training. The MDTA establishments in the several sites were impressive -- and frustrating to both MDTA and NYC personnel. MDTA wanted more trainees, and NYC wanted to place enrollees as trainees; but procedural problems stood in the way. At the time our samples were participating in the NYC programs, however, these auxillary programs had been used by not more than one or two percent of our samples. It thus appears at the time of our study the NYC program was not geared into the MDTA programs to any material extent and that most of the youths who left the NYC program went directly into the employment market primarily through referrals made by the NYC or by friends and relatives.

Remedial Education

All of the NYC programs we surveyed have had difficulty finding adequate facilities for educating out-of-school youths and motivating the youths when facilities are available. The problem lies both in the attitude of the enrollee toward the school and the attitude of the school toward enrollees. Many schools do not want these youths, have encouraged them to leave, and make it difficult for them to return to full-time school.

Another difficulty reducing the tendency of youth to continue education is the gap between the requirement that evening school students be 18 years old and the regulation of regular school permitting the youth to drop out at 16 years of age. Thus, frequently evening school is not available to the youth between 16 and 18 years of age.

NYC programs have tried three different approaches for improving the basic educational level of enrollees. Some programs have organized educational opportunities outside of the school system. Others have attempted to arrange additional resources within the school system itself, and still others have tried to integrate basic education with work experience.

The programs which organize educational opportunities outside of the school system are based on the assumption that the enrollees are already negatively conditioned to formal school and that it is better to start afresh and provide them with opportunities which do not have the negative connotations of conventional schooling. Such classes are conducted during the evening hours, in locations outside of the school building, in small groups, and with a considerable amount of freedom for the student. Durham has such a program and our interview results showed that 63 percent of the male subjects in the Experimental sample as compared with only nine percent of the male subjects in the Control sample reported attending educational or vocational classes after dropping out of school. While these results are highly encouraging, our observations suggest that such programs tend to depend on the personal commitment of the administrators and teachers, and may lose their effectiveness under adverse conditions when enthusiasm wanes.

The programs conducted within school systems which we reviewed are administered by school personnel during the regular school day and are taught by teachers who are part of the school system. These programs have the advantage of institutional stability but can suffer from lack of enthusiasm and from a tendency of school systems to assign uninspired personnel to this kind of work. School system programs and programs combining education and work experience were at too early a stage of development to be reflected in our data.

An important goal of NYC administrators should be to stimulate the local school system to expand its services and to experiment with innovative approaches which may improve the quality of remedial education programs for youths between 16 and 22. In the absence of effective remedial education programs run by the local school system, it becomes necessary to organize such programs through the NYC program. In Phase II of our research we plan to study several experimental efforts to use Job Corps remedial education materials in Neighborhood Youth Corps settings.

Follow-up Counseling

There was widespread belief among NYC staff that many enrollees who obtained outside jobs were still somewhat deficient in their skills, attitudes, and knowledge of the requirements of the working world. This belief is supported by the high rate of unemployment of ex-enrollees. It is possible that many of them lost jobs which they might have kept if they had received advice and support during crisis periods. Some counselors said that they kept in touch with enrollees informally after they left the program, and that enrollees sometimes came back on their own for advice. Follow-up counseling is not provided systematically and consideration might be given to increasing the effectiveness of the NYC program by providing counseling assistance to ex-enrollees during the transition period while they are making their adjustment to the world of work.

Differential Needs of Enrollees

In the NYC programs studied, little effort was made to appraise the needs of enrollees and to tailor work assignments or training to meet these needs. Existing tests of aptitude and skills have not proved to be particularly useful within the NYC setting and there is a widely felt need for diagnostic procedures specifically geared to the needs of enrollees. Our observations indicate the deficiencies of these youth can be grouped into three general areas; lack of opportunity, rebellious attitude toward authority, and low self-esteem.

Some deficiencies result from inadequacies in the opportunities for educational experiences available to the youth both in the formal school system and through their family experience. These are examples of system failures resulting in disadvantage to the individual regardless of his attitude or motivations. Within this category are two sub-types, a disadvantaged group and an adverse situation group. Many disadvantaged youth have been found who have graduated from the school system without having learned the basic skills necessary to function in jobs requiring language facility (disadvantaged graduate group). Other well-socialized individuals drop out of school because of some situational factor such as the need to support their families, pregnancy, etc. (adverse situation group). Such individuals have been caught in circumstances beyond their control and need the opportunity to fill in gaps in their formal education.

A second area of disadvantage results from a poor attitude toward authority and work. Many disadvantaged youth have not developed sufficient self-discipline to be able to meet the requirements of a job and have a suspicious attitude toward persons in authority (rebel group). They do not particularly feel that persons in authority are on their side and have not found that their needs can be met by complying with the requirements of authority. Until this is changed, they have great difficulty fitting into a working environment.

The third area of disadvantage is related to the self-concept of individuals coming from deprived environments (low self-esteem group). Having had bad experiences in the past, they tend both to view the world as hostile and antagonistic and to have doubts about their own capacity to obtain satisfactions from the world. Such individuals need to develop confidence in their own ability. These categories--the disadvantaged graduate, the adverse situation, the rebel, and the low self-esteem groups--are offered as hypotheses to be tested by carefully designed research. It is not, of course, possible to tailor the NYC program to fit each individual's needs; but it should be possible to develop broad strategies or "program mixes" appropriate to the principal kinds of deficiencies, thus permitting a flexible response to the needs of the enrollee. Possible differential strategies are discussed below.

a. Low Self-esteem Group

Youth in this group, while they frequently need the most help, are often the most difficult to work with. Many of them dropped out of school at an early grade, possess little in the way of behavioral skills, and often have severe personality problems. The extremely withdrawn or aggressive youth may have such serious intra-personal conflicts that it is not possible to work with him in the conventional manner.

It appears that the best strategy for improving self-esteem is to provide the opportunity for success experiences and to help the individual interpret these successes as worthwhile achievements. Earning money, completing a task, contributing to a common goal are all possible ways for an individual to experience success. During the period in which he is developing a sense of accomplishment and a belief that he can contribute to his own satisfaction by performing work, it is almost inevitable that some of the behaviors which have led to previous failures will lead to failure again. It is important, therefore, that he be able to fail without seriously adverse consequences. He needs to be able to start afresh in a new situation on at least several occasions so that he has a chance to break the vicious circle of repetitive failure resulting from his conviction that failure is inevitable. The greatest need for youth in this group is for sheltered work experience with sympathetic supervisors who do not put excessive demands on them. At this stage in his development the youth probably cannot profit from extensive counseling or formal remedial education or skill training. The role of the counselor should be to place the youth in the kind of work situation which can help build his self-confidence without putting excessive stress on him and help him interpret his progress and recognize his achievements. As the youth starts developing self-confidence and his performance improves, additional demands should be made upon him and the program component "mix" should change.

b. Rebel Group

Youth in this group get along reasonably well with their peers, are able to perform well in some activities, but have performed poorly in school and often have a history of delinquency. The first task of the NYC program is that of "social conditioning" or convincing them that they can function and obtain satisfactions in the legitimate areas of society. For these youth, the prime motivator at the beginning of the program is probably the money. For the program to be effective, however, it is necessary that their delinquent values be changed. Counselors or work supervisors can have a significant influence by serving as role models. Such youth also need to change their attitude toward authority and the requirements of work. They need to develop the self-discipline necessary to function in the world of work. Supervisors need to be encouraged to require the enrollees to meet the standards of achievement which are an essential ingredient of successful work performance. At this stage, counseling plays an important role. The counselor should keep an eye on how things are going between the enrollee and the supervisor and should be available to both of them for advice and interpretation. At this level, guided group interaction as a counseling technique could prove to be very useful. The youth is much more likely to listen to comments made by his peer group than to adults, and the group itself can serve as a reference group for changing his norms and helping him to understand the price he pays for delinquent behavior. At this stage the program "mix" should be more of a combination of work experience and different forms of counseling with the work supervisor himself performing an important part of the counseling function. Remedial education is not likely to be very effective until favorable attitudes toward authority or favorable self-concepts are developed. A typical school drop-out has already developed a negative attitude toward the school system and other socializing agents and is not likely to be able to learn effectively until some of these attitudes have been changed.

c. Adverse Situation Group

Youth in this category have a good attitude toward authority and work, but have dropped out of school because of some situational factor. Examples are youths who had to drop out of school to help support their families or girls who became pregnant and were unable to continue their education. Such individuals have been caught in circumstances beyond their control and need the opportunity to fill in the gaps in their formal education. With this group the primary emphasis in the program component "mix" should be on skill training and helping them obtain a high school diploma or its equivalent rather than on specific work experience.

d. Disadvantaged Graduate Group

It is regrettable, but true, that there are many graduates from ghetto schools who have not learned the basic skills necessary to function adequately in jobs above the unskilled level. They frequently have a reasonably good academic record and are suffering from deficiencies in the educational system rather than their own failures. They may also be weak in job seeking skills or suffer from employment discrimination. Our research shows that Negro females comprise the great majority of this group. These enrollees are already sufficiently well motivated and disciplined to profit from formal education and skill training. The primary emphasis in the program "mix" should thus be on skill training and supplementing educational preparation rather than on specific work experiences. They may also need vocational guidance and help in finding a job.

A number of NYC programs have been experimenting with techniques for assisting enrollees in this group. A good example is the Co-op Program in Cincinnati which appears to be working exceptionally well. NYC enrollees who have at least completed the 10th grade, have had clerical courses in school, who show an interest in entering this field, and who can develop an accurate typing speed of 25 words per minute within a week are eligible. The girls attend classes in typing, office skills, related remedial education and job sophistication for a four-week period and work in a user agency for an additional four week period. This continues until the enrollees have attained sufficient skills to be placed in permanent employment. The NYC sponsor reports that most girls are ready for placement in three to six months.

Any typology is a conceptual tool for useful classification and not an exact description of each individual case. Some subjects will fall neatly into one of the categories and others will not. The groups cannot be expected to be mutually exclusive; but rather will reflect overlapping areas of disadvantage.

Our present data permits only a rough estimate of the distribution of enrollees in urban out-of-school programs among the above four types. The majority of the females appear to fall into the disadvantaged graduate or adverse situation groups; the smallest proportion fall into the rebel group with the remaining falling into the low self-esteem group. Among males, the largest proportion fall into the rebel group, followed by the low self-esteem, adverse situation, and disadvantaged graduate groups. In Phase II of the research more accurate information will be obtained about the distribution of enrollees among types, and preliminary efforts will be made to develop measures for classifying enrollees into these categories and evaluating their progress while they are participating in the NYC program.

In summary, while the results of this study cannot be generalized to all NYC programs since the programs studied were specially selected, the data demonstrate achievements but also highlight problem areas and program issues which have been discussed above. Since the time reflected in this study, many improvements in the programs have been made in each of the cities serving as research sites, and it is reasonable to assume that better results are now being obtained. The prospective studies currently under way will test this assumption. A second follow-up interview is planned for the first part of 1968, at which time an additional year will have elapsed since the date of application. On the basis of data developed from these interviews, it should be possible to test more adequately the hypothesis that NYC experience is associated with improved work and community adjustment.

APPENDIX A

Technical Appendix

The basic hypothesis of this research was that NYC experience helps youth to make better community and employment adjustments. This hypothesis was tested by comparing Experimental subjects who had participated in the program with equivalent Control subjects who had not. For an adequate test to be made, it was necessary that the Experimental group be a representative sample of the NYC enrollee population in a specified period and the Control group be closely matched with the Experimental group on all relevant variables.

In experimental research, when some of the relevant variables are not known, the soundest methodology for establishing Experimental and Control samples is to assign subjects on a random basis prior to the start of the experimental treatment. This methodology obviously could not be used in retrospective studies; and, even in a prospective study, it is frequently not feasible when using human subjects. It was thus necessary to use other procedures to establish the Experimental and Control samples. The procedures used in the four study sites were those that appeared most likely to provide the best results. Sampling procedures were varied partly because the different sites presented differing sampling problems, and partly because one of the goals of the project was to explore effective methodologies for studies of this kind.

Before reviewing the procedures used in these retrospective studies, it can be noted that no matter what method is selected, it can be expected to contain defects. If, for example, the Control subjects are matched with the Experimental subjects on a one-to-one basis through nominations, there is always the uncontrolled variable that the Experimental subject applied for, and got accepted in the program, while the Control subject did not. If, on the other hand, all the subjects have applied, but some have enrolled and some have

TABLE A-1

INTERVIEW RESULTS, FOUR RESEARCH SITES

Sample & Site	Interviewed										Not Interviewed										Total				
	NYC Experience					No NYC Experience					Activity Information					No Activity Information									
	Negro Female	Negro Male	White Male	White Female	Total	Negro Female	Negro Male	White Male	White Female	Total	Negro Female	Negro Male	White Male	White Female	Total	Negro Female	Negro Male	White Male	White Female	Total	Negro Female	Negro Male	White Male	White Female	Total
Experimental:																									
Cincinnati	45	31	16	3	95						3	10	8	1	22	7	4	9	3	23	55	45	33	7	140
St.Louis[a]	91	13	3	4	111						3	6	0	0	9	8	5			13	102	24	3	4	133
E.St.Louis	31	50	0	0	81						0	8	0	0	8	8	29	0	0	37	39	87	0	0	126
Durham	77	23	4	1	105						1	6	0	0	7	4	8	3	2	17	82	37	7	3	129
Total	244	117	23	8	392						7	30	8	1	46	27	46	12	5	90	278	193	43	14	528
Control:																									
Cincinnati	15	6	1	0	22	31	15	14	4	64	3	11	5	0	19	12	20	15	8	55	61	52	35	12	160
St.Louis[a]	31	18	2	4	55	37	11	6	1	55	1	4	0	0	5	14	11			25	83	44	8	5	140
E.St.Louis	4	3	0	0	7	9	9	0	0	18	1	6	0	0	7	20	52	0	0	72	34	70	0	0	104
Durham	19	7	0	0	26	43	19	3	3	68	0	2	0	0	2	15	7	2	0	24	77	35	5	3	120
Total	69	34	3	4	110	120	54	23	8	205	5	23	5	0	33	61	90	17	8	176	255	201	48	20	524

[a] Racial information lacking for "Not Interviewed" subjects but, for convenience, these subjects have been tabulated as "Negro" males and females.

not there will be the uncontrolled variable associated with being admitted to the program. The defects inherent in various sampling methods must be considered in evaluating results obtained from the variously-established samples. It should also be noted that retrospective studies necessarily rely on old records. The quality of the information available in such records cannot be expected to be as reliable or as useful as information gathered with research goals in mind and the problems created by weaknesses in records were evident in many places in this report.

The composite samples discussed in this report contained study subjects from four research sites (see Table A-1). The interview results are summarized in Table A-2. The samples in each site are discussed in the following sections of this appendix.

TABLE A-2

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW RESULTS, FOUR RESEARCH SITES

Sample and Site	Number	Complete Interview	Partial Interview	Not Interviewed
		Percent	Percent	Percent
Experimental:				
Cincinnati	140	68	16	16
St. Louis	133	84	7	10
East St. Louis	126	64	6	29
Durham	129	81	5	13
Total	528	74	9	17
Control:				
Cincinnati	160	54	12	34
St. Louis	140	79	5	18
East St. Louis	104	24	7	69
Durham	120	78	2	20
Total	524	60	26	34

Cincinnati

Sample Selection

In the Cincinnati study, it seemed the best research strategy was to select the Control subjects at random from the applicant population and to compare them with the Experimental sample after information about them was available. Necessary adjustments to improve the match of the two groups could then be made. It would obviously have been better to have matched the samples before the interviewing was started but this was impossible because of the limited information available about the Control subjects.

The sampling procedure used a fixed interval applied to lists of enrollees and applicants. Both lists were informally stratified by area of the city by keeping the names from areas of the city together. Because of incomplete information about the Control subjects, no other efforts were made to stratify the sample. While the sampling procedure can reasonably be expected to produce representative samples of the two populations at the time the sample was selected, it does not guarantee that the Experimental and Control samples will be equivalent on relevant variables unless the assumption is made that the enrollee and applicant populations are themselves equivalent. This is a highly questionable assumption and highlights the difficulties in establishing a proper Control group.

The NYC out-of-school program was decentralized at the time the sample was selected into seven neighborhood centers located in the poverty pockets where the majority of potential NYC applicants reside. Candidates for the NYC program were required to register at a neighborhood center and were called when a job opening was available. Since there were many more applicants than available positions at the time the sample was selected, April, 1966, less than one-third of the applicants were enrolled in the program. When suitable job vacancies became available, appointments were offered in the order in which the candidates applied. For those who were enrolled, there was an average interval of about six weeks between the date of registration and date of enrollment in NYC.

Two lists of names were prepared for each neighborhood center. One list was the active participants in NYC and the other was those who had registered but had not enrolled. At the time the sample was constituted, there were 1,189 youths enrolled in the program and 2,414 youths registered but not enrolled. First, the total number on each list was divided by the desired sample size of 125, and the closest integer used as the interval for picking subjects from the list. Subjects were eliminated from the Control group if they did not meet eligibility standards for enrollment in NYC or if they subsequently enrolled. Fifteen subjects who were known to have attended out-of-state schools were removed from the Experimental sample because their school records would not be available. When it was found that the subjects in the sample were difficult to locate, the sample size was increased to 140 Experimental subjects and 160 Controls. Replacements and additions were selected by use of an appropriate integer as the selection interval.

School and Police Records

School records were obtained from the pupils' personnel files maintained by the local school system. Records were located for 75 percent of the Experimental subjects and 60 percent of the Controls. Recorded police contacts were obtained by checking the name of the subjects with the city police records and recording the date, nature, and disposition of each recorded charge.

Interviewing

Attempts were made to interview all subjects included in the Experimental and Control samples.[1] Interviewers who were familiar with the particular populations from which the samples were drawn, such as local teachers, NYC counselors, and parole officers, were selected and trained by a field supervisor employed for this project. The interviewing was conducted over a four-and-a-half-month period and extreme difficulty was encountered locating subjects. Among the subjects who were interviewed, approximately half of the addresses were found to be incorrect and frequent return visits were required.

Adequacy of Experimental Sample

The present activity of the subjects was determined for 84 percent of the Experimental sample and 66 percent of the Control group. Full interviews were completed for 68 percent of the Experimental sample and 54 percent of the Controls. The major reasons located subjects could not be interviewed were that they were in the military service, in the Job Corps, or in jail. Negroes were easier to locate than whites, with the completion rate the highest for Negro females and lowest for white females. The returns for white females turned out to be so low both in total numbers and in completion rate that no separate statistical analysis is being made in this report of data for this subsample.

[1] See Appendix B for interview schedule

Since comparisons are being made in this report between subsamples within the Experimental group, the interview completion rate is analyzed in Table A-3 by sex and race.

TABLE A-3

INTERVIEW COMPLETION RATE FOR EXPERIMENTAL SAMPLE IN CINCINNATI

Category		Determined Subject's Current Activity Percentage	Completed Full Interview Percentage
Negro female	(N=55)	87	82
Negro male	(N=45)	91	69
White female	(N=7)	57	43
White male	(N=33)	77	51
Total sample	(N=140)	84	68

An examination of the differences between the interviewed and non-interviewed Experimental subjects shows there was no difference with respect to average or highest school grade completed. Males who were not interviewed had significantly more police contacts than those who were interviewed. (See Table A-4.)

TABLE A-4

COMPARISON OF INTERVIEWED WITH NON-INTERVIEWED EXPERIMENTAL SUBJECTS

	Interviewed	Not Interviewed		CL[a]
		Present Activity Determined	No Information Obtained	
	(N=95)	(N=22)	(N=23)	
		Percentage of Samples		
Negro females	47	14	30	ns
Negro males	33	46	17	ns
White males	17	36	39	.05
White females	3	5	13	.10
Total	100	101	99	
		Mean of Samples		
Age (February, 1967)	20.4	20.5	20.3	ns
Police contacts prior to Registration Date:				
Males	4.0	4.3	5.6	.05
Females	.7	2.3	.1	ns
Highest school grade completed[b]	10.0	10.0	10.0	ns

[a] Confidence level of the difference between interviewed subjects and subjects about whom no information was available

[b] Based on information provided at time of application for NYC program

Adequacy of Control Sample

The interview completion rate for the Control sample was less than was desired, but the match between the Experimental and Control samples was remarkably close.

Table A-5,which lists the completion rate by sex and by race, shows that Negro subjects were located more frequently than were whites.

TABLE A-5

INTERVIEW COMPLETION RATE FOR CONTROL SUBJECTS

Category		Determined Subject's Current Activity	Completed Full Interview
		Percentage	Percentage
Negro females	(N=61)	80	75
Negro males	(N=52)	62	40
White males	(N=35)	57	43
White females	(N=12)	33	33
Total sample	(N=160)	66	54

Subjects who could not be located differed in two important respects from the subjects who were interviewed. As was the case of the Experimental subjects, the males who could not be located had a significantly higher average number of police contacts than did the male subjects who were interviewed. It was also more likely that their school records could not be obtained through the local school system suggesting either that they had not attended the local schools or that their records had been lost. The school records could not be obtained for 40 percent of the Control subjects who could not be located, while only 27 percent of the records were missing for the other Control subjects, and 25 percent for all of the Experimental subjects (see Table A-6). It is possible, therefore, that a significant portion of the Control samples was more mobile than the Experimental sample and that the exclusion of such individuals may actually have improved the match between the Control and Experimental samples.

TABLE A-6

COMPARISON OF INTERVIEWED WITH NON-INTERVIEWED CONTROL SUBJECTS ON SELECTED VARIABLES

Variables	Interviewed	Not Interviewed		CL[a]
		Present Activity Determined	No Information Obtained	
	(N=86)	(N=19)	(N=55)	
		Percentage		
Negro females	53	17	22	.01
Negro males	24	58	36	ns
White males	17	26	27	.10
White females	5	0	15	.05
Total	99	101	100	
		Mean		
Age (February, 1967)	20.7	20.5	20.6	ns
Highest grade completed	10.2	10.5	9.7	ns
Average police contacts per subject prior to registration date:				
Males	3.5	4.2	4.4	.05
Females	.8	.7	.8	ns

[a] Confidence level of the difference between interviewed subjects and subjects about whom no information was available

Durham

Sample Selection

In this site, all applicants for the NYC program completed the standard NYC enrollment form at the local office of the state's Employment Security Commission. The completed forms were filed chronologically. The preliminary listing of the Experimental sample, prepared from this file, contained the names of all applicants for the out-of-school program who had completed application forms in the months of October, November, and December, 1965.

This preliminary listing was then checked through the NYC files, and the names of individuals who had not actually enrolled in the out-of-school program were deleted. In the period of the preliminary listing, there was often a time lag between completing the application form and NYC assignment. This delay undoubtedly contributed to the failure of some applicants to complete their enrollments by reporting to a work station. The lag also resulted in enrollees entering the program several weeks subsequent to the date of application. In all, the names of 129 enrollees who began their NYC experience in the last quarter of 1965 and the first weeks of 1966 comprised the original Experimental sample.

When the Experimental subjects were checked through the NYC files, the schools last attended were ascertained. School lists were then prepared containing the names, sex, year of birth, and highest school grade completed of Experimental subjects who had dropped out of the various schools. In each school involved, the listed subjects were matched as closely as possible with other former students. The help of school counselors was enlisted, and, whenever possible, matches reflected behavioral and residential similarity. Information as to race, lacking on the NYC application form, was supplied from personal knowledge at some point in the matching process.

The preliminary listing of the Control sample was prepared, in large part, by the procedures just described. A few Experimental subjects could not be matched in this way: some had not attended local schools, and some had attended a school that had burned and consequently lacked records. These subjects were matched" by individuals similar in terms of race, sex, age, and school achievement. The preliminary listing of the Control sample was checked through the NYC files, and all individuals with a record of NYC enrollment were eliminated. The remaining individuals, 120 in all, comprised the original Control sample.

Police Records

The names of subjects in the two study samples were checked against police files by police personnel in February, 1967. The extent of recorded police contact in Durham was thus ascertained for all study subjects. These data were not matching variables, but provided information useful for judging the closeness of the match as well as a criterion variable of social adjustment.

Interviewing

The Field Supervisor in this site was an employee of the local NYC sponsor. At the outset he trained two unemployed adult male Negroes as interviewers. These men, both of whom had cars, were able to work during the week as well as the usual part-time hours of weekday evenings and weekends. Interviewing proved to be more time-consuming than had been anticipated largely because of the difficulty of locating subjects. Towards the end of the interviewing period, additional interviewers were secured. In all, 15 interviewers--ten men and five women--worked in the study. The interviewers used in the final part of the interviewing period, young adult Negroes for the most part, worked part-time; and some of them worked only a single weekend.

Interviewers noted particular difficulties in locating subjects. Many of the addresses of subjects were out-of-date, especially in the Control sample where the address was that obtained from school records at the time of school drop-out. Some addresses had entirely disappeared in the process of urban renewal. The inaccuracy of address information led to a second difficulty, that of establishing sufficient trust to get locating information from the subject's former neighbors. Interviewers found that first impressions were important. They found that if a man, for example, wore a windbreaker jacket and work shoes, drove a car with an out-of-state license, and did not carry a briefcase, he had less difficulty in establishing trust; i.e., that he was not connected with legal, military, welfare or credit agencies. Standard methods of locating subjects through the Post Office, the police, and managers of public housing were frequently ineffective because the interviewers had the subjects' names only and not the names of their parents or of their husbands in the case of married females.

Adequacy of Experimental Sample

Activity reports of the Durham NYC program indicated that substantially all of the new enrollments in a period running from October 1965, through the first weeks of January, 1966, appeared in the original listings of the Experimental sample (see Table A-7). It is possible, however, that these new enrollments were not entirely representative of the out-of-school enrollee population. The Experimental sample contained a preponderance of females (66 percent) and of Negroes (93 percent). Staff members of the NYC felt that these percentages reflected the enrollee population reasonably well. In a program that is not only expanding but experiencing considerable enrollee turnover, it is very difficult to ascertain objectively the characteristics of the enrollee population at a given point or period in time.

TABLE A-7

ACTIVITY REPORTS, DURHAM NYC OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAM,
OCTOBER, 1965 - JANUARY, 1967

Period Ending	Enrollees at ending	Net enrollee Increase
September 30, 1965	209	--
October 29, 1965	218	9
November 30, 1965	282	64
January 31, 1966	351	69

Adequacy of Control Sample

In terms of selection variables, the original listing of the Control sample was closely similar to that of the Experimental sample (see Table A-8). The interviewing process not only produced information permitting the comparison of the two samples in terms of other variables, but modified the effective size of the samples.

TABLE A-8

COMPARISON ON SELECTION VARIABLES, ORIGINAL LISTINGS, EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SAMPLES, DURHAM

Variables	Experimental (N=129)	Control (N=120)	CL
	Percentage	Percentage	
Negro female	64	64	--
Negro male	29	29	--
White female	02	03	ns
White male	05	04	ns
	Mean	Mean	
Age (February, 1967)	20.4	20.1	ns
Highest school grade completed	8.5	8.6	ns

Approximately 80 percent of the subjects in both lists were interviewed (see Table A-9). Subsequent to their listing in the Control sample, however, 23 percent of the Control subjects had enrolled in the NYC and were thereby ineligible for the Control sample. This reduced the size of the Control sample but indicated that the selection procedures had located individuals in the same general population as the Experimental subjects. Although the interview completion rate in the Experimental sample, 81 percent, was higher than that in the Control, 78 percent, the difference was not statistically significant (see Table A-9). The current activity of subjects who could not be interviewed was determined for an additional five percent of the Experimental sample, and two percent of the Control. Significantly more of the subjects in the Control sample could not be located.

TABLE A-9

INTERVIEWING RESULTS, EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SAMPLES

Results	Experimental		Control	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Interviews completed	105	81	94	78
Not interviewed, activity information				
In Job Corps	4	3	--	--
In military service	--	--	2	2
In jail	2	2	--	--
Not interviewed				
Dead	1	1	--	--
Moved out of area	6	5	7	6
Could not locate	11	9	17	14
Totals	129	101	120	100

The interviewed samples were substantially similar on many matching variables. It is of particular interest that the interviewed samples did not differ significantly in two measures of financial disadvantage: public housing residency, and receipt of welfare assistance. The appreciable percentage of the Control sample as originally listed that enrolled in the NYC also attests to the fact that the sampling procedures identified individuals whose financial status was comparable to that of the subjects in the Experimental sample. At the same time, the percentage of Control subjects reporting welfare assistance was smaller than that in the Experimental sample. It is possible that listed Control subjects with welfare assistance were more apt to have enrolled in the NYC and thus to have become ineligible for the Control sample. The two samples also differed in that Experimental subjects were significantly more mobile, and female subjects in the Experimental sample averaged more children.

East St. Louis

Sample Selection

The Experimental sample in East St. Louis was made up of all individuals known to have been enrolled in the NYC out-of-school program in the last quarter of 1965, and who lived in an area bounded on the North by Missouri Avenue, on the East by 26th Street, on the South by the city limits, and on the West by 9th Street. The residential qualification resulted in an all-Negro sample. A total of 126 individuals met these selection criteria and constituted the Experimental sample. These were listed by schools of last attendance, most of which were in East St. Louis. The lists were then taken to the schools, and matches were sought for the Experimental subjects in terms of sex, age, highest school grade completed, and area of residence. Individuals identified through this matching procedure who were not known to have enrolled in the NYC constituted the Control sample. The Control sample contained 104 subjects; and, although smaller than the Experimental sample, was closely similar to the enrollee group in terms of race, sex, age, school experience, and area of residence.

Police Records

Police department personnel checked the names of study subjects, noting the date and character of each recorded police contact. The amount of police contact for study subjects was less than would have been expected on the basis of the city's crime rate,[1] but it was about what would have been expected on the basis of a recent study of delinquency in East St. Louis.[2]

Interviewing

The Field Supervisor, a teacher, recruited a small interviewing crew from school personnel. Toward the end of the interviewing period, the interviewing staff was enlarged by the addition of eleven interviewers and a co-supervisor. The latter was also a teacher, and the newer interviewers were, for the most part, students or housewives. Like the subjects in this site, all of the project's field personnel were Negroes. Many of the interviewers were natives of East St. Louis, and a few had prior interviewing experience.

Severe difficulties were encountered in locating subjects despite the city's apparent residential stability, the geographical limitation of the samples, and the indigenous backgrounds of the interviewers. As in Durham, the difficulties stemmed from the fact that many subjects did not live at the addresses listed for them. Like the Durham interviewers, the interviewers in East St. Louis also found that standard locating resources, such as the Post Office, required name information additional to that of the subjects. The East St. Louis interviewers were less successful than the Durham interviewers, however, in developing information regarding the subjects' whereabouts through informal sources. Their failures were particularly apparent in the Control sample. It is possible that the East St. Louis interviewers somehow failed to allay the suspicions of potential informants. It is also possible that a large proportion of the Control subjects could not be located because they had moved out of the area.

---

[1] See supra Table 1, p 7.

[2] Albert H. Baugher, John William Rawlin, Robert Peters, and Thomas R. Hughes for the Delinquency Study Project, C.V. Matthews, Director, Official Delinquency Rates and Patterns in East St. Louis, Illinois, Southern Illinois University (1964).

Adequacy of the Experimental Sample

In the Experimental sample, interviews were completed for 64 percent of the subjects, and the current activity of an additional six percent of the subjects was ascertained (see Table A-10). The interviewed portion of the sample was closely similar to the sample as originally listed in terms of selection variables (see Table A-11). The composition of the Experimental sample and its completion rate indicate that this sample adequately represented the inner-city enrollment in the NYC out-of-school program in the period of the retrospective study.

TABLE A-10

INTERVIEWING RESULTS, EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SAMPLES EAST ST. LOUIS

Result	Experimental		Control	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Interviewed				
In study sample	81	64	18	17
In NYC (sample ineligible)	--	--	7	7
Not interviewed, activity information				
In Job Corps	3	2	--	--
In military service	4	3	7	7
In jail	1	1	--	--
Not interviewed				
Dead	1	1	--	--
Refused	--	--	1	1
Moved out of area	7	6	15	14
Could not locate	29	23	56	54
Total	126	100	104	100

TABLE A-11

COMPARISON OF ORIGINAL LISTING AND INTERVIEWED SAMPLES, SELECTION VARIABLES, EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SAMPLES, EAST ST. LOUIS

Variable	Experimental			Control		
	Original (N=126)	Interviewed (N=81)	CL	Original (N=104)	Interviewed (N=18)	CL
	Percentage			Percentage		
Race and Sex						
Negro female	31	38	ns	32	50	ns
Negro male	69	62	ns	68	50	ns
	Mean			Mean		
Age (February,1967)	20.5	20.7	ns	20.4	20.9	ns
Highest grade completed	10.2	10.5	ns	10.2	10.4	ns

Adequacy of the Control Sample

In the Control sample, the interview completion rate was very much lower (see Table A-10). Although the interviewed portion of the sample was closely similar to the total sample (see Table A-11), the low completion rate vitiated the usefulness of the sample for in-site comparisons. At the same time, the numerical inadequacy of the interviewed portion of the East St. Louis Control sample does not preclude the inclusion of these interviews in the composite four-site Control sample.

St. Louis

Sample Selection

The St. Louis sample for the retrospective study was drawn from a population of 1,200 youth in the out-of-school program. The study samples were drawn during the months of September-October, 1966. Relatively little information about the characteristics of the NYC youth in St. Louis existed at this time, so no attempt was made to stratify the sample. The sample selected for the study included all youth who were enrolled in the NYC program at one of four major intake and work sites, a State Hospital for the mentally ill. The reasons for selecting this group of youth were based on the judgment of program staff that the group was representative of the St. Louis program, that continuity of staff at the site would assist the research staff, use of one site would facilitate access to enrollee records, and the potential opportunity offered in supplementing the research with data from other studies of the NYC enrollees at the Hospital.

All youth enrolled in the State Hospital NYC program from the period of December 1, 1965, to March 1, 1966 (133 individuals) were included in the

Experimental sample. A Control group was obtained from young people who had made application to NYC during the same period of time but who had not been enrolled. A total of 140 youth were obtained for the Control group in this manner.

Police Records

The names of subjects in the two study samples were checked against police files by police personnel in February, 1967. The extent of recorded police contact in St. Louis was ascertained for all study subjects. These data were not used as matching variables, but provided information useful for judging the closeness of the match as well as a criterion variable of social adjustment.

Interviewing

The first step in the attempt to interview all of the subjects in both the Control and Experimental samples was to mail a return receipt requested letter to each youth explaining the purpose of the study and indicating that an interviewer would be calling on him. After the card had been received verifying the address of the youth or supplying the new address, the interviewers tried to interview the youth. While this procedure failed to supply correct addresses for about 20 percent of the youth, it was most helpful in verifying the correct addresses of the remaining 80 percent of the youth.

The interviewers used at this site had had experience in working with low income youth either as settlement house workers, probation officers, teachers, or recreation workers. Interviewing continued over a period of four months. As in the other cities it was found extremely difficult to locate the youth.

One frequently encounterered difficulty was the general suspiciousness of the people in neighborhoods. Interviewers would make inquiries about a youth and be assured that no such person lived in the area. Later, they would find that the subject lived next door to the informant who had denied any knowledge of the subject's whereabouts.

The interview completion rate finally obtained reflects a great deal of effort; many visits were often necessary to locate a youth at home. Community resources such as employment files, police records, and records of agencies who had frequent contacts with this group of youth were utilized in an effort to locate the young people in the sample.

Adequacy of Experimental Sample

Interviews were completed for 83 percent of the subjects in the Experimental sample, and the current activity was ascertained for an additional seven percent of the subjects in the Experimental sample (see Table A-12). All told, some useful information was obtained from 90 percent of the subjects in the Experimental sample.

TABLE A-12

INTERVIEWING RESULTS, EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SAMPLES, ST. LOUIS

Results	Experimental (N=133) Percentage	Control (N=140) Percentage
Interviewed	83	78
Not interviewed, activity information	7	4
Not interviewed, no information	10	18
Total	100	100

Adequacy of Control Sample

Half of the interviewed subjects in the Control sample had acquired NYC experience and were thus ineligible for this study sample (see Table A-13). Apart from this development which reduced the number of interviewed Control subjects to 55, interviewing results were only slightly less successful in the Control sample than in the Experimental sample.

TABLE A-13

COMPARISON OF INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS, ELIGIBLE AND INELIGIBLE FOR CONTROL SAMPLE, ON SELECTED VARIABLES, ST. LOUIS

Variable	Eligible Control (N=55)	Ineligible Control (N=55)	CL
	Percentage	Percentage	
Sex			
Male	36	31	ns
Female	64	69	ns
Race			
Negro	89	87	ns
White	11	13	ns
Marital status - single	72	70	ns
Lives in public housing	20	19	ns
Receives public welfare	20	19	ns
Has lived most of life in large city or suburb	86	84	ns
Lived in metropolitan area over five years	90	86	ns
Lived in present neighborhood over five years	36	33	ns
Lives with both parents	24	24	ns
Father head of household	20	20	ns
Has physical defect	6	7	ns
	Mean	Mean	
Age	19.9	19.6	ns
Highest school grade completed	9.9	9.9	ns
Number of children	.7	.7	ns
Months out of school	16.8	17.4	ns

Comparisons on selected variables showed no significant differences between the subjects in the Control sample who remained eligible for the study sample and those who became ineligible because of their NYC enrollment (see Table A-13).

In St. Louis, information as to the race of sample subjects was not available at the time the samples were constituted. The non-interviewed portions of the sample cannot, therefore, be checked on this important variable. In view of the high completion rate in both samples and of the close correspondence between the eligible and ineligible portions of the Control sample, the study samples appear to be adequate so far as population characteristics are concerned. The size of the eligible Control sample is, of course, somewhat smaller than was anticipated.

Statistical Analysis

Standard statistical procedures were used to determine the statistical significance of difference in values. The chi square formula with a correction made for continuity was used to test the significance of differences observed between frequencies. The t test formula was used to test the significance of the difference between means, and a monograph[1] based on the t test formula was used to test the significance of differences between percentages. In discussing confidence levels throughout this report, "significant" refers to the .05 level, "very significant" to the .01 level and "highly significant" to the .001 level. To help avoid Type II errors, notice is sometimes taken of probability levels which are between .05 and .25 when evidence from other sources suggests they should be noted. Such levels are never referred to as significant but should be considered to represent a zone of suspended judgment with respect to the relationship being considered.

---

[1] Vernon Davies, Rapid Method for Determining Significance of the Difference between Two Percentages. (Washington Agricultural Experimental Stations) Institute of Agricultural Science, Washington State University Stations Circular 151, Revised July, 1962.

APPENDIX B

B.O.B. No. 44-6628
Exp. 7/30/67

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTED OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAMS
NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Social Research Group
The George Washington University

Follow-up Interview Form
SRG/NYC 05 Page 1

ID __ __ __ __ __
3 4 5 6 7

I. PERSONAL DATA

A. NAME (print) ________________________________
(last) (first) (middle/maiden)

B. ADDRESS ________________________________
(number) (street) (city) (state)

C. ZIP CODE ________________ D. SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER ________________

E. TELEPHONE ________________ ________________
(number) (name)

F. PARENT OR GUARDIAN

Name ________________________ (____________)
(relation to subject)

Address ________________ Telephone ________________

G. ALTERNATE PERSON KNOWING SUBJECT'S WHEREABOUTS:

Name ________________________ (____________)
(relation to subject)

Address ________________ Telephone ________________

H. SCHOOL LAST ATTENDED ________________________________
(name) (place)

I. BIRTH PLACE ________________________________
8-9 (city) (state)

J. BIRTH DATE __/ __/ __/ K. AGE ____ L. SEX Male ____ Female ____
10-11 12 (1) (2)

M. ETHNIC ORIGIN Caucasian ___ Mexican-American ___ Negro ___
13 (1) (2) (3)

Puerto Rican ___ Other (specify) ________________________
(4) (5)

ID __ __ __ __ __

N. MARITAL STATUS Single __ (1) Married __ (2) Divorced, Sep. __ (3) Widowed __ (4)
14
Marital Status on (date*). Using codes above, please check: (1) __
15
(2) __ (3) __ (4) __. If change, when, __/ __/ __/ Describe ____

O. NUMBER OF YOUTH'S OWN CHILDREN? __ 16 Own children in household __ 17

Number of youth's own children on date* __ 18 Own children in household on date* __ 19 If change, when __/ __/ __/ Describe ____________

P. IN METROPOLITAN AREA 0-6 mos. __ (1) 7-12 mos. __ (2) 13-24 mos. __ (3)

2-5 yrs. __ (4) 6-10 yrs. __ (5) 11, or more yrs. __ (6)

Q. IN PRESENT NEIGHBORHOOD 0-6 mos. __ (1) 7-12 mos. __ (2) 13-24 mos. __ (3)

2-5 yrs. __ (4) 6-10 yrs. __ (5) 11, or more yrs. __ (6)

R. LIVED MOST OF TIME BEFORE AGE 16 In large city (pop. 100,000 or more) __ (2)
22
In suburb of a large city __ (2) In a middle-sized or small city (pop. less than 100,000) but not in a suburb of a large city __ (3) Small town of less than 10,000 __ (4) Open country, but not on a farm __ (5) On a farm __ (6)

II. FAMILY BACKGROUND

A. YOUTH LIVES WITH Both parents __ (1) Father only __ (2) Mother only __ (3)
23
Guardian __ (4) Spouse __ (5) Alone __ (6) Other (specify) ______________ (7)

Youth lived with on date* (check) (1) __ (2) __ (3) __ (4) __
24
(5) __ (6) __ If change, when __/ __/ __/ Describe ______________

---

* The date in the ______________ Retrospective study is ______________. In change items such as this, use the item code to enter information for date. If change has occurred, enter date of change and describe what happened.

I) __ __ __ __ __

B. HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD IS Father __ (1) Mother __ (2) Male Guardian __ (3)
25
Female Guardian __ (4) Youth __ (5) Other (specify) ____________________

Head of Household on date* (check) (1) __ (2) __ (3) __ (4) __
26
(5) __ (6) __

If change, when __/ __/ __/ Describe ____________________

C. USUAL OCCUPATION OF FATHER ____________________
27-28

D. USUAL OCCUPATION OF MOTHER ____________________
29-30

E. YOUTH RESIDES IN PUBLIC HOUSING Yes __ (1) No __ (2)
31
Youth in public housing on date* Yes __ (1) No __ (2)

If change, when __/ __/ __/ Describe ____________________

F. FAMILY RECEIVES WELFARE ASSISTANCE Yes __ No __
32
Family received welfare assistance on date* Yes __ No __

If change, when __/ __/ __/ Describe ____________________

G. YOUTH IS CURRENTLY SUPPORTED BY (Please check sources of support and
33-34
circle principal source) Earnings __ (1) Unemployment Compensation __ (2)

Welfare Aid __ (3) Family __ (4) Spouse __ (5) Training allowances __ (6)

Scholarships __ (7) Loans __ (8) Savings __ (9) Other (specify) ____________________

____________________ (10)

III. EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

A. WHEN DID YOU LEAVE SCHOOL (Month) ____________ 35 (Year) ____________ 36

B. WHAT WAS HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE COMPLETED? 3, or less __ (1) 4-6 __ (2)
37
7-8 __ (3) 9 __ (4) 10 __ (5) 11 __ (6) 12 __ (7) 13-15 __ (8) 16, and up __ (9)

C. WHAT WERE YOUR REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL? Academic __ (1) Economic __ (2)
38
Discipline __ (3) Health __ (4) Graduation __ (5) Other (specify) ____________________

____________________ (6)

ID __ __ __ __ __

D. DID YOU HAVE VOCATIONAL COURSES IN SCHOOL? Yes __ No __
39
If yes, describe. (write on back of page 3 if additional space is needed)

Course ____________________

From __/__/ to __/__/ Hours per week ____________
mo yr mo yr

Course ____________________

From __/__ to __/__/ Hours per week ____________

E. HAVE YOU ATTENDED NIGHT SCHOOL CLASSES SINCE LEAVING SCHOOL? Yes __ No ___
40
If yes, describe. (write on back of page 3 if additional space is needed)

Course ____________________

From __/__/ to __/__/ Hours per week ____________

Course ____________________

From __/__/ to __/__/ Hours per week ____________

F. HAVE YOU HAD VOCATIONAL TRAINING SINCE LEAVING SCHOOL? Yes __ No __
41
If yes, describe. (Write on back of page 3 if additional space is needed)

Skill ____________________

From __/__/ to __/__/ Hours per week

Skill ____________________

From __/__/ to __/__/ Hours per week ____________

SRG/NYC 05 Page 5

ID _ _ _ _ _ _

IV. WORK EXPERIENCE

A. ARE YOU NOW (check one) Employed ___ (1) Employed and attending
42
school ___ (2) Attending school, not employed ___ (3) In training
program ___ (4) Unemployed ___ (5) Other (specify) ______________________

____ (6)

B. IF ATTENDING SCHOOL, describe giving date of enrollment and times

of attendance, ______________________________________

____

C. IF IN TRAINING PROGRAM, describe, giving date of enrollment and

times of attendance, ______________________________________

____

D. IF UNEMPLOYED, EVER EMPLOYED SINCE LEAVING SCHOOL? Yes ___ No ___

E. IF UNEMPLOYED, BUT EMPLOYED SINCE LEAVING SCHOOL, WHY DID YOU
43
LEAVE YOUR LAST JOB? Job ended ___ (1) Quit ___ (2) Was fired ___ (3)
moved ___ (4) Was jailed ___ (5) Ill health ___ (6) Returned to school ___ (7)
Better job ___ (8) Other (specify) ______________________

____ (9)

F. WE WOULD APPRECIATE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB:

Employer ______________________________________
(name of firm)

Address ______________________________________
(number) (street) (city) (state)

Supervisor ______________________________________
(last name) (first name) (initial)

Job Title ______________________________________
44-45

Duration of employment From __/__/__/ To __/__/__/
46-47

Average hrs. per week ___ Average hourly earnings ______________
48-49 50-51-52

ID __ __ __ __ __

G. HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT YOUR CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB? (please check)
53
Employment Service __(1) Private Employment Agency __(2) School __(3)
Friends or Relatives __(4) Previous Employer __(5) Advertisements __(6)
Neighborhood Youth Corps __(7) Other (specify) ____________________
____________________________________ (8)

H. HAVE YOU HAD ANY OTHER JOBS SINCE (date) * Yes __(1) No __(2)
54
All told, how many jobs have you had since (date) * ____________

I. HOW MANY MONTHS HAVE YOU BEEN EMPLOYED SINCE (date*) ____________
55-56

J. HOW MANY MONTHS HAVE YOU BEEN UNEMPLOYED SINCE (date*) ____________

K. HAVE YOU SERVED IN THE MILITARY SERVICE? Yes __ No __ If so,
57
when ____________________________________

L. HAVE YOU ENROLLED IN THE JOB CORPS? Yes __ No __ If so, when
58
____

M. HAVE YOU ENROLLED IN AN MDTA PROGRAM? Yes __ No __ If so, when
59
____

N. HAVE YOU ENROLLED IN AN ON-THE-JOB TRAINING PROGRAM? Yes __ No __
60
If so, when ____________________________________

O. YOUTH'S LIFETIME OCCUPATIONAL GOAL ____________________
61-62
____

P. YOUTH'S ESTIMATE OF CHANCE OF ACHIEVING GOAL: Excellent __(1)
63
Reasonably Good __(2) Slight __(3) Unlikely __(4)

Why ____________________________________

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

V. EXPERIENCE

A. MOST USEFUL ASPECTS OF NYC EXPERIENCE (check as many as apply,
64
and circle most important) Learning work habits ___ (1) Learning job skills ___ (2) Classroom work ___ (3) Counseling ___ (4) Help in getting a job ___ (5) Money ___ (6)

Other (specify) ______________________________ (7)

Nothing useful about experience ___ (8)

B. HOW DID YOU FIRST HEAR ABOUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS?
65
Employment Service ___ (1) Youth Opportunity Center ___ (2) Neighborhood Opportunity Center ___ (3) NYC Staff ___ (4) School Staff ___ (5) Friends in NYC ___ (6) Friends not in NYC ___ (7) Read about it in newspapers or magazines ___ (8) Heard about it on radio or TV ___ (9) Other (specify) ______________________________ (10)

C. HOW LONG DID YOU WORK (Have you Worked) AT NYC?
66-67

From __/__/__/ To __/__/__/

From __/__/__/ To __/__/__/

From __/__/__/ To __/__/__/

D. RATING OF NYC EXPERIENCE (please rate by circling appropriate
68
number)

Waste of time				Extremely useful
1	2	3	4	5

E. WHAT KIND OF WORK DID (Do) YOU DO? ______________________________
69-70

____

ID _ _ _ _ _

F. DID (Do) YOU ENJOY THIS WORK? Very much ___ (1) Somewhat ___ (2) Not much ___ (3) Not at all ___ (4)

G. HOW IMPORTANT WAS (is) THIS WORK? (Please rate by circling appropriate number)
72

Very Important				Unimportant
1	2	3	4	5

H. HOW CLOSELY WERE (Are) YOU SUPERVISED? Very closely supervised ___ (1)
73
Fairly closely supervised ___ (2) Somewhat unsupervised ___ (3) Not supervised at all ___ (4)

I. HOW HELPFUL WAS (Is) YOUR SUPERVISOR? Very helpful ___ (1) Fairly
74
helpful ___ (2) A little helpful ___ (3) Not helpful at all ___ (4) A hindrance ___ (5)

J. HOW FRIENDLY WERE (Are) YOUR FELLOW WORKERS? Very friendly ___ (1)
75
Fairly friendly ___ (2) A little friendly ___ (3) Not friendly at all ___ (4) Openly hostile ___ (5)

K. HOW MANY TIMES DID (Do) YOU MEET WITH YOUR COUNSELOR? More Than
76
once a week ___ (1) About once a week ___ (2) About once a month ___ (3) Less than once a month ___ (4) Not at all ___ (5) Didn't (Don't) have a counselor ___ (6)

L. HOW HELPFUL WAS (Is) YOUR COUNSELOR? Very helpful ___ (1) Fairly
77
helpful ___ (2) A little helpful ___ (3) Not helpful at all ___ (4) A hindrance ___ (5)

M. DID (Do) YOU PARTICIPATE IN ANY SPECIAL NYC EDUCATION OR TRAINING
78
PROGRAMS? Yes ___ No ___ If yes, describe ______________________________

____

ID _ _ _ _ _

N. IF YES, HOW DID (Do) THEY HELP YOU? ____________________
79

____

O. WHAT DID (Do) YOU LIKE BEST ABOUT YOUR NYC EXPERIENCE?
8

____

P. WHAT, IF ANYTHING, DID (Do) YOU DISLIKE ABOUT YOUR NYC
9
EXPERIENCE? ____________________

Q. DO YOU THINK YOUR NYC EXPERIENCE WAS (Will be) ANY HELP TO

YOU IN GETTING A JOB? Yes ___ (1) No ___ (2) If yes, how? ___
10

____

VI. INTERVIEWER'S IMPRESSIONS

A. APPEARANCE (please rate by circling the appropriate number)

11	Inappropriate Dress 1	2	3	4	5	Appropriate Dress
12	Dirty 1	2	3	4	5	Clean
13	Unkempt 1	2	3	4	5	Neat
14	Poor Posture 1	2	3	4	5	Good Posture
15	Unhealthy Appearance 1	2	3	4	5	Healthy Appearance
16	Awkward 1	2	3	4	5	Poised

SRG/NYC 05 Page 10

ID _ _ _ _ _

B. SPEECH (Please rate by circling appropriate number)

17	Mumbles				Speaks Clearly
	1	2	3	4	5
18	Halting				Fluent
	1	2	3	4	5
19	Ungrammatical				Good Grammar
	1	2	3	4	5
20	Heavy Accent or Dialect				Standard Speech
	1	2	3	4	5

C. APPROACH (Please rate by circling appropriate number)

21	Hostile				Friendly
	1	2	3	4	5
22	Apathetic				Interested
	1	2	3	4	5
23	Timid				Confident
	1	2	3	4	5

D. INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF YOUTH'S OCCUPATIONAL GOAL: Low ___ (1)
24
Reasonable ___ (2) Unrealistically High ___ (3) WHY? ____________

____

E. ANY OBVIOUS PHYSICAL DEFECTS? Yes ___ (1) No ___ (2) If yes, please
25
describe ____________________________________

____

VII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

____
Interviewer

____
Date

This information is being obtained as part of a research study conducted by The George Washington University under a contract with the Department of Labor and the information will be kept confidential.

APPENDIX C

Occupational Categories

I Clerical Work

- File clerk, stenographer, secretary
- Postal clerk, mailman
- Stock clerk, packer, shipping clerk
- Grocery checker
- Data processing machine operator
- Room clerk
- Bookkeeper
- Dispatcher
- Messenger
- Circular distributor
- Cashier

II Sales Clerk

- Indoor sales clerk
- Outdoor sales (insurance, real estate, door-to-door)
- Telephone sales

III Food Processing and Service

- Meat processor, butcher, cutter
- Restaurant and institutional food handling
- Waiter
- Chef
- Car hop

IV Protective Services

- Policeman
- Fireman
- Guard

V Indoor Cleaning and Maintenance

- Domestic service
- Janitor in public building
- Porter

VI Outdoor Cleaning and Maintenance

- Highway maintenance
- Park maintenance

VII Machine Trades

- Machine shop worker
- Machinist
- Diemaker
- Sheetmetal worker
- Factory machine operator

VIII Structural Trades

- Bricklayer
- Carpenter
- Plumber
- Plasterer
- Electrician
- Electrician's helper
- Cement finisher
- Painter
- Roofer's helper

IX Repair Trades

- Appliance repairman
- Automobile mechanic
- Mechanic trainee
- Radio and T.V. repairman

X Other trades

- Seamstress, tailor
- Laundress, ironer, presser
- Beautician, barber, hairdresser
- Printer
- Craftsman (shoemaker, cabinet maker)

XI Horticultural Work

- Farm
- Nursery
- Landscaping

XII Unskilled Labor

- Laborer
- Car Washer
- Construction laborer or helper
- Factory worker

XIII Managerial

- Merchant
- Restaurant manager

XIV Professional

- Teacher
- Nurse
- Engineer
- Minister
- Architect
- Social work
- Scientist
- Artist
- Musician

XV Professional Aide or Sub-Professional

- Recreational leader, group worker, block worker
- Draftsman
- Laboratory technician
- Child care, nursing assistant
- Animal care
- Teacher's aide

XVI Vehicle Driver

- Truck driver
- Cab driver
- Bus driver

APPENDIX D

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OUT-OF-SCHOOL NYC EXPERIENCE AND ENROLLEES' POLICE RECORD - CINCINNATI, OHIO

This is a preliminary report of research conducted under a contract with the Department of Labor to study the effectiveness of selected out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps programs. As part of a retrospective study at one of the research sites (Cincinnati, Ohio), this investigation attempts to determine if participation in the NYC out-of-school program has reduced the number of police charges placed against enrollees as compared with the police record of youths with similar background who have not participated in the program. Police records are considered to be a measure of community adjustment, and thus, one appropriate standard for judging program effectiveness.

Research Design

This study included 230 youths between the ages of sixteen and twenty-two divided equally into an Experimental and Control group. The Experimental group of 115 subjects was selected at random from approximately 800 youths enrolled in the Cincinnati out-of-school NYC program in April, 1966, at the selected research site. Although there was a much higher proportion of females in the population, it was decided to select approximately the same number of each sex so that the data for boys and girls could be studied separately. A Control group was selected from a list of applicants who had applied for the program prior to April, 1966, but had not been enrolled by December, 1966. The Control subjects were also selected at random and subjects were then added or subtracted at random by categories until the Experimental and Control groups were matched as closely as possible on the variables of age, sex, race, school grade completed and date of application for NYC enrollment (see Table D-1).

TABLE D-1

COMPARISON BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL
ON SELECTED VARIABLES

Variables	Experimental Sample (N=115)	Control Sample (N=115)
	Number	Number
Negro females	[illegible]	49
Negro males	30	30
White males	27	27
White females	9	9
Total males	57	57
Total females	58	58
Total whites	36	36
Total Negroes	79	79
Average age (December,1966)	20.11	20.25
Average school grade completed	10.02	10.11

The number of police charges was obtained by checking the names of the subjects with the city police records and recording the date, nature and disposition of each recorded charge. If the police record showed the charge was unfounded, or if the subject was a victim, the incident was not counted. The average time between date of application and date police records were checked was fifteen months.

Police records as a criterion of program effectiveness have limitations which should be considered when interpreting the data. Some of the charges may be dismissed; there may be differential treatment based on class, race, or sex; and there is likely to be considerable under reporting, particularly of crimes committed outside the city. We believe, nevertheless, that the police record is the best measure available of delinquent or criminal behavior and that the limitations apply equally to the Experimental and Control groups.

Results

Almost half of the subjects in both samples had a police record with an average number of 2.55 charges per subject. More boys (sixty-three percent) than girls (31 percent) had records, with the boys averaging about six times as many charges as the girls, an average of 4.36 charges compared to .74. For both the Experimental and Control groups there seemed to be a substantial decrease in recorded police contacts as the youths became older. This decrease has been frequently noted in studies of crime and delinquency and may be due to changes in the behavior of the youth and/or the reporting practices of the police. Whatever the causes of this reduction, they can be expected to apply to the Experimental and Control groups equally.

The Negro males in the Experimental sample had a higher rate of police contacts than the other males in the samples and the nature of these charges tended to be more serious. They had been charged prior to the date of their application for NYC with an average of 2.77 offenses against property and other persons as compared with a rate of 1.35 for all white males and 1.10 for Negro males included in the Control sample. The difference between the Negro males in the Experimental group and other males was statistically significant at the .05 level (chi square=4.15, d.f.=1). This means that there is a less than 5% probability that this result could have occurred through chance.

A reduction was found in the total number of police charges for the Experimental groups after application for NYC as compared with the Control group. There was a 10 percent probability that this result could have occurred through chance (chi square=3.03, d.f.=1).

TABLE D-2

NUMBER OF POLICE CHARGES OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS BEFORE AND AFTER NYC APPLICATION DATE

Period of Time	Experimental Group	Control Group
Before application date	294	250
After application date	15	23

When consideration was limited to the more serious crimes against property and other persons, the differences between the two groups was greater. The youths enrolled in the NYC, on the average, were charged with less serious offenses than the Control group. The percentage of the total represented by these charges decreased from 49% to 20% for the Experimental and increased from 38% to 48% for the Control samples. This difference was statistically significant at the .02 level (chi square=6.57. d.f.=1).

TABLE D-3

CHARGES FOR CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY AND OTHER PERSONS
FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS BEFORE AND
AFTER NYC APPLICATION DATE

Period of Time	Experimental Sample		Control Sample	
	Number	Percentage[a]	Number	Percentage[a]
Before application date	143	49%	96	38%
After application date	3	20%	11	48%

[a] Calculated by dividing total number of charges into number of charges involving crimes against property and persons.

Although the numbers are small, the most dramatic reduction was in the female subsample. Only one girl in the Experimental group was charged after the date of application, and this for a minor offense (runaway), while eight charges were placed against girls in the Control group. A direct computation of the probabilities indicates that there is less than a four percent possibility that this result would have occurred through chance.

TABLE D-4

POLICE CHARGES FOR FEMALE SAMPLE BEFORE AND AFTER DATE OF NYC REGISTRATION

Period of Time	Experimental Group	Control Group
Before registration date	35	41
After registration date	1	8

Discussion

A question basic to the validity of the results of this study is the degree to which the Experimental and Control groups can be considered equivalent on the variables influencing number of police contacts. The two groups were selected from a pool of applicants for the NYC program, some of whom were enrolled and some were not. While it is not known why particular applicants did not enroll, assumptions can be made about the variables involved. Chance seems to have been a major factor. There was approximately a one month delay between application and enrollment due to the excess of applicants. Which applicant was enrolled depended to a considerable degree on the nature of the specific job-slot which became available. Another factor was the length of time the applicant remained available. Probably reasons for non-enrollment include finding other jobs, returning to school, joining the Armed Forces, leaving the city, or being financially ineligible for the program. The subjects in both samples are currently being interviewed and more definite information will be developed about the reasons the Control subjects did not enroll in the program. On the basis of the present evidence, there is no reason to assume, apart from NYC influences, that the NYC enrollee sample is less likely to have contacts with the police than the Control sample. Actually, it is more reasonable to assume that because the Control subjects are more likely to have left the city, they have had less opportunity to get into difficulties with the city police.

The tendency found in this study for enrollees to be charged with fewer offenses than Control subjects is consistent with the impressions of police officials in this and other cities reported to us during the reconnaissance phase of our research, that the out-of-school NYC program is noticeably decreasing crimes among the youths participating in the program. The dramatic reduction in the quantity and quality of police contacts among girls enrolled in the NYC as compared with boys is consistant with the observation that better job assignments are provided for females than for males. Females are assigned as clerical assistants, child care aids, nursing assistants and to other work they find meaningful. Males, on the other hand, are more likely to be assigned to custodial, ground keeping, street cleaning, and similar types of work which they frequently dislike.

The relatively large number of charges placed against the Negro male subjects in the Experimental group as compared with the Control group prior to application for the NYC program is evidence that the program is recruiting "hard core" Negro male youths. The reduction in number of serious crimes while not statistically significant is encouraging.

The results of this study lead to the tentative conclusion that enrollment in this out-of-school NYC program is associated with a decline in the number and gravity of police contacts, particularly among female enrollees. The small size of the sample, the limited information available about both the Experimental and Control subjects, and the short period which has elapsed since the date of application, indicate a need for caution in the interpretation of the results. Information developed from following these samples over a longer period of time will provide a more adequate testing of the hypothesis that out-of-school NYC experiences reduce crime and delinquency.

ATTACHMENT A

SUMMARY OF RECORDED POLICE CHARGES

	Experimental Group				Control Group			
	Number in Sample	Number of Charges	Average Number of Charges	Percent of Sample Charge	Number in Sample	Number of Charges	Average Number of Charges	Percent of Sample Charged
Before Application Date								
Negro males	30	143	4.77	70%	30	93	3.10	50%
White males	27	116	4.30	67%	27	116	4.30	65%
Negro females	49	35	.71	35%	49	37	.76	35%
White females	9	0	.00	0%	9	4	.44	22%
Total Males	57	259	4.54	68%	57	209	3.67	57%
Total Females	58	35	.60	29%	58	41	.71	34%
Total sample	115	294	2.58	49%	115	250	2.17	45%
After Application Date								
Negro males	30	6	.20	10%	30	6	.20	13%
White males	27	8	.30	19%	27	9	.33	16%
Negro females	49	0	.00	0%	49	7	.14	13%
White females	9	1	.11	11%	9	1	.11	11%
Total males	57	14	.25	14%	57	15	.26	14%
Total females	58	1	.02	2%	58	8	.14	12%
Total sample	115	15	.13	8%	115	23	.20	13%

ATTACHMENT B

RECORDED POLICE CHARGES OF MALES BEFORE DATE OF APPLICATION FOR NYC

Type of Charge	Negro Male		White Male		Total Male	
	Exp.[a] N=30	Cont[a] N=30	Exp. N=27	Cont. N=27	Exp. N=57	Cont. N=57
Crimes Against Property						
Petty larceny	25	14	14	15	39	29
Grand larceny	1	2	0	1	1	3
Forgery	1	2	2	2	3	4
Burglary	10	9	8	0	18	9
Attempted burglary	1	0	0	0	1	0
Robbery	0	2	1	0	1	2
Strong armed robbery	2	0	0	1	2	1
Attempted robbery	0	1	0	1	0	2
Auto larceny	6	1	4	2	10	3
Breaking & entering	10	0	4	3	14	3
Destruction of property	6	1	6	4	12	5
Tampering	2	1	0	2	2	3
Extortion	2	0	0	0	2	0
Shoplifting	6	0	3	1	9	1
Arson	0	1	0	3	0	4
Receiver stolen goods	2	1	0	1	2	2
Possession stolen goods	0	0	0	1	1	1
Purse snatching	0	0	1	0	1	0
Auto looting	0	0	1	0	1	0
Total	74	35	44	37	118	72
Crimes Against Persons						
Threatened assault	0	0	1	0	1	0
Assault & battery	3	2	2	3	5	5
Assault	6	5	0	2	6	7
Rape	0	2	1	0	1	2
Total	9	9	4	5	13	14
Other Charges						
Disorderly conduct	4	7	4	6	8	13
Questionable conduct	16	11	16	12	32	23
Fighting	5	5	0	5	5	10
Truancy	5	4	5	11	10	15
Late hours	0	0	8	6	8	6
Drunk	0	1	1	1	1	2
Drinking	1	0	1	4	2	4
Loitering	0	2	5	1	5	3
Trespassing	4	2	2	7	6	9

ATTACHMENT B, cont.

Type of Charge	Negro Male		White Male		Total Male	
	Exp. N=30	Cont. N=30	Exp. N=27	Cont. N=27	Exp. N=57	Cont. N=57
Investigatory pickup	1	2	6	3	7	5
Shooting air rifle	4	0	1	1	5	1
Parole violation	3	0	4	4	7	4
Incorrigible	0	1	2	1	2	2
Sexual delinquency	1	1	0	0	1	1
Cruelty to animals	0	0	2	1	2	1
Narcotics	1	0	0	0	1	0
Runaway	0	1	6	6	6	7
Carrying concealed weapons	3	0	0	1	3	1
Traffic	5	4	2	2	7	6
Miscellaneous	7	9	5	4	12	13
Total	60	50	70	76	130	126
TOTAL CHARGES	143	94	118	118	261	212

[a] Note: Exp. means Experimental group and Cont. means Control group

ATTACHMENT C

RECORDED POLICE CHARGES OF FEMALES BEFORE DATE OF APPLICATION FOR NYC

Type of Charge	Negro Female		White Female		Total Female	
	Exp. N=49	Cont. N=49	Exp. N=9	Cont. N=9	Exp. N=58	Cont. N=58
Crimes against property						
Petty larceny	6	5	0	0	6	5
Extortion	1	0	0	0	1	0
Auto larceny	2	0	0	0	2	0
Breaking & entering	1	0	0	1	1	1
Destruction of property	1	0	0	1	1	1
Shoplifting	1	4	0	0	1	4
Receiver stolen goods	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	12	10	0	2	12	12
Crimes against persons						
Assault & battery	2	0	0	0	2	0
Assault	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	2	1	0	0	2	1
Other charges						
Disorderly conduct	1	1	0	0	1	1
Questionable conduct	1	2	0	0	1	2
Truancy	2	1	0	1	2	2
Late hours	2	1	0	0	2	1
Drinking	1	0	0	1	1	1
Investigatory pickup	2	6	0	0	2	6
Parole violation	1	1	0	0	1	1
Incorrigible	2	2	0	0	2	2
Sex delinquency	1	3	0	0	1	3
Runaway	5	3	0	0	5	3
Fighting	0	4	0	0	0	4
Traffic	0	1	0	0	0	1
Miscellaneous	3	1	0	0	3	1
Total	21	26	0	2	21	28
TOTAL CHARGES	35	37	0	4	35	41

ATTACHMENT D

RECORDED POLICE CHARGES OF MALES AFTER DATE OF APPLICATION FOR NYC

Type of Charge	Negro Males		White Males		Total Males	
	Exp. N=30	Cont. N=30	Exp. N=27	Cont. N=27	Exp. N=57	Cont. N=57
Crimes against property						
Petty larceny	0	0	0	1	0	1
Strong armed robbery	1	0	0	0	1	0
Auto larceny	0	0	0	1	0	1
Tampering	0	1	0	1	0	2
Destruction of property	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total	1	1	0	4	1	5
Crimes against persons						
Assault	0	1	1	2	1	3
Assault & battery	0	1	0	0	0	1
Rape	1	0	0	0	1	0
Total	1	2	1	2	2	4
Other charges						
Disorderly conduct	3	1	1	0	4	1
Questionable conduct	1	0	1	-	2	0
Drunk	0	0	2	1	2	1
Trespassing	0	0	2	0	2	0
Drinking	0	0	2	0	2	0
Traffic	0	0	1	1	1	1
Miscellaneous	0	2	0	0	0	2
Total	4	3	7	3	11	6
TOTAL CHARGES	6	6	8	9	14	15

ATTACHMENT E

RECORDED POLICE CHARGES OF FEMALES AFTER DATE OF APPLICATION FOR NYC

Type of Charge	Negro Female		White Female		Total Female	
	Exp. N=49	Cont. N=49	Exp. N=9	Cont. N=9	Exp. N=58	Cont. N=58
Crimes against property						
Petty larceny	0	1	0	0	0	1
Shoplifting	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	0	2	0	0	0	2
Other charges						
Disorderly conduct	0	1	0	0	0	1
Questionable conduct	0	1	0	0	0	1
Sex activity	0	1	0	0	0	1
Child neglect	0	1	0	0	0	1
Traffic	0	1	0	1	0	2
Runaway	0	0	1	0	1	0
Total	0	5	1	1	1	6
TOTAL CHARGES	0	7	1	1	1	8

APPENDIX E

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OUT-OF-SCHOOL NYC ENROLLMENT AND POLICE CONTACTS-DURHAM, N.C.

This appendix reports a study of the effectiveness of the out-of-school NYC program in Durham in terms of police contact data. Like the similar Cincinnati study,[1] this study of program effectiveness hypothesized that NYC enrollment would be associated with reduced police contact; and the study hypothesis was tested by comparing data from the Experimental sample with data from the Control sample.

The major conclusions of this report were reached in March, 1967, before interview data could be utilized. The comparative groups at that time were substantially the Experimental and Control samples of the retrospective study in Durham as originally listed.[2] The N's of the comparative groups did not exactly correspond, however, to the N's of the samples as originally listed. In the Experimental group, the present study contained four individuals who were subsequently found to have begun their NYC experience in the in-school program; and, in the Control group, 18 individuals known at that time to have enrolled in the NYC had been eliminated from the original listing. The two final sections of this report reflect the interviewed subjects of the retrospective samples in this site.

Both the Experimental group of 133 persons and the Control group of 102 were predominantly Negro (93 percent) and female (67 percent). The two groups were closely matched, differing by less than one percent in racial and sex proportions, mean average age, and highest school grade completed. On December 31, 1965, the date after which substantially all of the Experimental subjects had become active NYC enrollees, the mean average age of both groups was very close to nineteen (see Table E-1).

---

[1] See Appendix D

[2] See Appendix A, p.86-89, for sample selection procedures in this site.

TABLE E-1

COMPARISON BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SAMPLES ON SELECTED VARIABLES

Variables	Experimental Sample (N=133)	Control Sample (N=102)
	Percentage	Percentage
Negro female	65.4	64.7
Negro male	27.8	28.4
White female	1.5	2.0
White male	5.3	4.9
Total	100.0	100.0
	Mean	Mean
Average age, December 31, 1965	19.08	18.95
Highest school grade completed	8.46	8.42
Percentage of sample having juvenile referrals	13%	9%
Average number of referrals	.25	.20

The individuals in the two samples were checked through the files of the local police department, and each recorded contact was described by date, nature, and disposition. Consistent with the practice in the previous study, when more than one charge was recorded for a single day, only the most serious charge was counted.

The reporting practices in Durham differed substantially from those of Cincinnati, the site of the preceding study. In Durham juvenile contacts (those occurring prior to the youth's sixteenth birthday) were reported to us only when they led to a referral to "Juvenile Authorities." In Cincinnati all recorded contacts were made available, regardless of the age of the subject. It seems probable that the reporting practice in Durham minimized the number of juvenile contacts and accentuated their severity to the point where juvenile contact data are not comparable between the two sites.

Results

To be eligible for enrollment in an NYC out-of-school program, a youth must be sixteen years old. Up to the age of sixteen, as we have seen, the Experimental and Control groups were substantially similar in terms of recorded police contacts. A minority of 13 percent of the Experimental subjects, and 9 percent of the Control subjects had been referred to Juvenile Authorities. After the age of sixteen police contacts are described by the nature of the charge as well as by disposition. These post-juvenile contacts are the principal data of this analysis.

In the period before December 31, 1965, the Experimental group contained twenty-one youth with adult police contacts, and the Control group, five (see Attachment A). This difference between the two groups was statistically significant at well beyond the .01 level. The Experimental group also tended to have more charges per individual. Thus the difference between the two groups with respect to the number of charges was even greater. These results indicate very clearly that, although the juvenile records of the two groups appeared to be approximately equivalent, the adult behavior prior to date of entry into NYC was very different. The Experimental group got into far more trouble with the police.

The number of adult charges in the Experimental group declined from 45 before December 31, 1965, to 27 after this date (see Attachments B & C). In the Control group, on the other hand, the number rose from seven before to ten after. (see Table E2). The overall pattern is one of before/after decrease among the enrollees, and of before/after increase among the non-enrollees. Although visible as a pattern, the difference between the two groups approaches but does not quite reach statistical significance. (chi square = 3.02, d.f. =1)[1]

---

[1] Unless otherwise noted, statistical significance in this analysis means a chi square value indicating significance at the .05 level; that is, a result that could be attributed to chance factors less than five times out of a hundred. The procedure commonly known as the Yates' correction has been used in the calculation of chi square values.

TABLE E-2

ADULT POLICE CONTACTS, EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SAMPLES BEFORE AND AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1965

Period of Time	Experimental Sample (N=133)		Control Sample (N=102)	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Before December 31, 1965	45	.34	7	.07
After December 31, 1965	27	.20	10	.10

The nature of adult charges can be analyzed in three broad categories: crimes involving property, crimes involving other persons, and other (see Attachment D). Considering only the first two categories, charges associated with serious crimes, the reversal pattern is again apparent (see Table E-3). The frequencies describing a before/after decrease in serious charges in the Experimental group and a before/after increase in the Control group support a conclusion of statistical significance (chi square = 4.441, d.f. = 1).

TABLE E-3

ADULT CONTACTS INVOLVING CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY AND PERSONS, EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS, BEFORE AND AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1965

Period of Time	Experimental Sample (N=133)		Control Sample (N=102)	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Before December 31, 1965	34	.26	1	.01
After December 31, 1965	19	.14	6	.06

The number of white youth in both samples was too small to permit meaningful comparisons on the basis of race. Considering only the Negro subsamples, males showed a strikingly greater police involvement than did females (see Table E-4). In the Experimental group, the average number of contacts involving serious charges was from 15 to 20 times greater among males and the proportion of the subsample involved was three out of ten among the males, as compared with one out of twenty, or less, among the females. In the Control group, the Negro female subsample had no serious police contacts.

TABLE E-4

COMPARISON BETWEEN NEGRO MALES AND FEMALES, AVERAGE NUMBER OF ADULT CONTACTS INVOLVING PROPERTY AND PERSONS AND PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLE HAVING SUCH CONTACTS, BEFORE AND AFTER 12/31/65

Samples	Before		After	
	Average	Percentage	Average	Percentage
Experimental Group				
Negro male (N=37)	.76	30%	.41	30%
Negro female (N=87)	.05	5%	.02	2%
Control Group				
Negro male (N=29)	.03	3%	.17	17%
Negro female (N=66)	00	0	00	00

In summary, police contact data from Durham indicated that the social maladjustment implied in police contacts was markedly more prevalent, extensive and serious in the Experimental group before December 31, 1965. After that date, police involvement in the Experimental group decreased, while that of the Control group increased. At the time of the police record search, February, 1967, however, the incidence and extent of police involvement was still greater in the Experimental group. Owing to the small numbers of white subjects, racial comparisons could not be made. Comparisons on the basis of sex within the Negro subsample showed that males were strikingly more involved in police contacts.

Comparison with the Cincinnati Results

The previous study of police contacts in Cincinnati produced the tentative conclusion that enrollment in an out-of-school NYC program is associated with a reduction in the number and gravity of police contacts. The results of the present study are consistent with this conclusion. In Cincinnati the sharpest decrease was apparent among NYC female enrollees. Data from Durham do not duplicate the finding of relatively greater effectiveness among females, perhaps because the police contacts of girls in Durham were negligible in all study component groups.

Differences in the form of police contact data from the two sites make it difficult, if not impossible, to compare measures of police involvement. In Cincinnati all contacts were recorded regardless of the age of the individual, whereas, in Durham, juvenile contacts were recorded only when they resulted in referral to Juvenile Authorities. It is likely that juvenile contacts in Durham reflected only the more serious contacts, and that the juvenile contacts in Cincinnati included many less serious contacts.

In the period after NYC enrollment, when police contacts were in the adult category, 32 percent of the males in the Durham Experimental group averaged .57 contacts apiece. In Cincinnati, 14 percent of the males in the Experimental group averaged .25 contacts apiece after enrollment. This direct comparison suggests a somewhat sharper and more persistent community maladjustment among the males in the Experimental group in Durham. This result is consistent with the F.B.I.'s report of a total offense rate of 946.3 per 100,000 inhabitants in Cincinnati, and a rate of 1,288.8 for Durham.[1]

In a foreword to Uniform Crime Rates, 1965, the reader is cautioned "against drawing conclusions from direct comparisons of crime figures between individual communities without first considering the factors involved."[2] Differences in the community contexts, as well as the differences in the data reported, suggest that the primary utility of rates of police contact is as a basis of comparison between Experimental and Control groups within each separate study site. Direct comparisons between sites require more qualification than can presently be supplied.

---

[1] Federal Bureau of Investigation, Crime in the United States - Uniform Crime Reports, 1965 (Washington, D.C.) Table 4

[2] Ibid., vii

Discussion

A striking aspect of the police contact data from Durham was the significantly higher rate of adult contacts in the Experimental group, particularly in the period before December, 1965. This aspect was dramatized by the fact that the Experimental group was closely similar to the Control group in terms of reported juvenile contacts. Subjects in both groups are currently being interviewed, and information from these interviews should throw some light on the situation.

In the meantime it could be speculated that selective factors are operating. Possibly the program was reaching into the hard core of disadvantaged youth, possibly these youth were channeled toward NYC through the closing of other opportunities. The relatively slighter involvement of Control subjects might reflect a relatively higher migration from the area, and a corresponding limitation of exposure to police contact in the study area.

The completion of interviewing will also permit a more exact association of NYC experience to police contacts. This analysis relates contacts to the fact of enrollment, but some enrollees were in the program only a short while and some are known still to be active. The additional information gained from the interviews can determine the amount of exposure to pickups by the local police. It seems likely that Control subjects would be more apt to have left the local police jurisdiction, and that the differences between the two groups would increase on the basis of additional information.

Police Contacts of Interviewed Subjects

When interviewing was completed, the police contacts of interviewed subjects in the Experimental and Control samples were compared. Since the police contacts of white subjects were negligible, only the Negro subsamples were considered. As with the pre-interview data, the police contacts of interviewed subjects in the Experimental sample were far greater than those of subjects in the Control sample (see Table E-5). The mean contacts of both samples decreased in the period after December 31, 1965. Prior to this date, Negro male subjects in the Experimental sample were more sharply maladjusted than comparable subjects in the Control sample; and after this date, this Experimental subsample showed significantly improved social adjustment as compared with the Control subsample. (Chi square = 5.086, d.f. = 1)

It is of interest that all of the Negro study subjects with police records prior to December 31, 1965, were located and interviewed. Some Negro study subjects with later police records, listed in the original samples, were not located and interviewed. This circumstance suggests that recent police contact may be a factor in non-completion of interviews.

TABLE E-5

ADULT POLICE CONTACTS, INTERVIEWED NEGRO SUBJECTS, EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SAMPLES, BEFORE AND AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1965

Subsamples		Before 12/31/65		After 12/31/65	
		Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Experimental:					
Negro Male	(N=23)	36	1.57	8	.35
Negro Female	(N=77)	9	.12	1	.01
All Negro	(N=100)	45	.45	9	.09
Control:					
Negro Male	(N=19)	3	.16	4	.21
Negro Female	(N=43)	3	.07	0	.0
All Negro	(N=62)	6	.10	4	.06

Police Contact and NYC Experience

These comparative analyses of police contact basically assume that subjects in both study samples were equally exposed to police contact. In order to relate pre- and post-NYC periods of enrollees to subjects in the Control sample, furthermore, it was necessary to use an average date (December 31, 1965) to demarcate the NYC experience. Although the two samples could not be compared without the use of a single common date, the average date of NYC enrollment did not, of course, exactly reflect the NYC experience of Experimental subjects. A detailed investigation of serious police contacts--those involving crimes against persons or property--of interviewed subjects in a 16-month period (September 1, 1965 to January 1, 1967) was accordingly undertaken.

In order to bring police contact data, NYC experience, and Control experience into the same time frame, police contacts recorded in the 16-month period, September 1, 1965 to January 1, 1967 were analyzed. This period contained 49 percent of the serious police contacts in the Experimental group, and 43 percent in the Control group. Half of the contacts in this period in the Experimental group occurred prior to NYC enrollment, one-fourth occurred during NYC enrollment and one-fourth occurred subsequent to enrollment. All of the contacts subsequent to NYC experience occurred during periods of unemployment, as did all of the contacts in the Control group in this 16-month period.

The time-controlled comparison of community adjustment showed substantially similar current adjustment in the two study samples (see Table E-6). In view of the markedly higher maladjustment in the Experimental group, prior to NYC enrollment, the program has achieved considerable immediate success. Whether the improved adjustment of Experimental subjects will continue can only be determined by future studies.

TABLE E-6

ADULT CONTACTS INVOLVING CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY AND PERSONS, AND PERIODS OF CONTACT, EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SAMPLES

Period	Experimental Sample (N=105)		Control Sample (N=68)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Before September 1, 1965	25	61	4	57
September 1, 1965 - December 31, 1966	16	39	3	43
(Before NYC)	(8)	(19)		
(During NYC)	(4)	(10)		
(After NYC)	(4)	(10)		
Total	41	100	7	100

ATTACHMENT A

NUMBER OF JUVENILE AND ADULT POLICE CONTACTS, BEFORE AND AFTER DECEMBER, 1965[1], EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

		Before 12/31/65				After 12/31/65	
		Juvenile				Adult	
		Youth	Contacts	Youth	Contacts	Youth	Contacts
		N	N	N	N	N	N
Experimental Group							
Negro male	(N=37)	13	29	13	36	13	21
Negro female	(N=87)	3	3	8	9	5	5
White male	(N=7)	1	1	0	0	1	1
White female	(N=2)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	(N=133)	17	33	21	45	19	27
Control Group							
Negro male	(N=29)	7	15	1	3	8	8
Negro female	(N=66)	2	5	3	3	0	0
White male	(N=5)	0	0	0	0	2	2
White female	(N=2)	0	0	1	1	0	0
Total	(N=102)	9	20	5	7	10	10

---

[1] There were no juvenile contacts after December 31, 1965.

ATTACHMENT B

NATURE OF ADULT POLICE CONTACTS BEFORE DECEMBER 31, 1965, EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SAMPLES

Sample		Police Charges			Total	
		Property	Persons	Other	Contacts	Youth
		N	N	N	N	N
Experimental						
Negro male	(N=37)	9	19	8	36	13
Negro female	(N=87)	3	3	3	9	8
White male	(N=7)	0	0	0	0	0
White female	(N=2)	0	0	0	0	0
Total	(N=133)	12	22	11	45	21
Control						
Negro male	(N=29)	0	1	2	3	1
Negro female	(N=66)	0	0	3	3	3
White male	(N=5)	0	0	0	0	0
White female	(N=2)	0	0	1	1	1
Total	(N=102)	0	1	6	7	5

ATTACHMENT C

NATURE OF ADULT POLICE CHARGES AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1965, EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

	Police Charges			Total	
	Property	Persons	Other	Contacts	Youths
	N	N	N	N	N
Experimental Group					
Negro male (N=37)	8	9	4	21	13
Negro female (N=87)	0	2	3	5	5
White male (N=7)	0	0	1	1	1
White female (N=2)	0	0	0	0	0
Total (N=133)	8	11	8	27	19
Control Group					
Negro male (N=29)	2	3	3	8	8
Negro female (N=66)	0	0	0	0	0
White male (N=5)	1	0	1	2	2
White female (N=2)	0	0	0	0	0
Total (N=102)	3	3	4	10	10

ATTACHMENT D

CHARGES INCLUDED IN CRIME CATEGORIES

Crimes Involving Property

Robbery with a deadly weapon
Housebreaking
Larceny
Storebreaking
Malicious injury to property
Worthless check

Crimes Involving Persons

Assault and battery
Assault and battery with a deadly weapon
Assault and battery with intent to kill
Assault and battery inflicting serious bodily injury
Assault and battery on a female
Assault and battery on a minor
Manslaughter
Rape
Bastardy

Other

Disorderly conduct
Public drunk
Trespassing
Carrying concealed weapon
Profane language
Resisting an officer
Violations of motor vehicle regulations